1-1-1975

A study of role perceptions of faculty at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst.

Elizabeth Courant Hruska
University of Massachusetts Amherst

A STUDY OF ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS/AMHERST

A Dissertation Presented

By

ELIZABETH COURANT HRUSKA

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

September 1975

A STUDY OF ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY AT
THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS/AMHERST

By

ELIZABETH J. KLEMER HRUSKA

Approved as to style and content by:

Richard Clark, Chairman of Committee

Jack Hewitt, Member

William Lauroesch, Member

Louis Fischer, Dean
School of Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An odd juxtaposition of events brought me back to the university at mid-life. Since then I owe more debts than I can ever repay or tell. But certain people have had particular importance to me in my years here. I give special thanks: to my father, Reginald Courant, who first urged me to return to the university; to Dwight Allen, who admitted me to the School of Education; to my brother and sister-in-law, Paul and Lyn Courtant, who devoted countless hours disentangling me from my old life; to my lawyer and his wife, Richard and Cynthia Gilman, whose generosity of time and advice helped straighten out my new life and enabled me to pursue my studies; to my committee chairman, Dick Clark, who encouraged me to follow my own initiative, and who provided warm support and precise criticism throughout all the dissertation phases; to committee member, Bill Lauroesch, in whose classes I first became excited about the possibility of a study in higher education; to committee member, Jack Hewitt, in whose class I first became interested in role theory; to Michael Melnik, Paul Adams, Glenn Erikson, and Dan Sheehan of the Clinic to Improve University Teaching who offered advice and criticism on specific problems; to Ken Ertel who kept me from drowning in my data; and to Grace Pleasants who organized the bibliography from suitcases of notes.

This study represents only a portion of my learning experience at the School of Education. A special acknowledgment must go to Sher Reichmann whose assistance in my professional development has been considerable.

Beth, Steve, Ben, Mark, Paul, and Kate Klemer deserve to be commended for bravely allowing their mother to embark on a new role. Most of all, I thank my husband, Jack Hruska, who arranged movies, roller-skating parties, sledding parties, picnics, fishing trips, and other outings for my children in addition to preparing meals and buying groceries in order that I might be free to complete my work. His love, energy, and encouragement have made the difference.

A Study of Role Perceptions of Faculty at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst (September 1975)

Elizabeth Courant Hruska, B.A., Tufts University
M.Ed., Boston University
Directed by: Dr. Richard J. Clark

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to investigate empirically the self-perceptions of faculty at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst on a variety of instructional roles in undergraduate classrooms. A further purpose was to discover to what extent certain subgrouping of faculty perceived their instructional roles differently. The information provided by the study is to be used as a base for faculty development.

A questionnaire was used for gathering data from a random sample of five hundred professors regarding their perceptions of the degree of emphasis given, satisfaction found, and training received on thirteen instructional roles.

The roles drawn from the higher education literature and listed on the questionnaire were: information processor, guide, example, credentialing agent, recruiter, catalyst, taskmaster, authority figure, screener, person, learner, resource, and facilitator.

Demographic variables thought to relate to one's role perceptions were included for cross tabulation with the

thirteen roles. The final three items on the six-page questionnaire asked faculty to rank the importance to them of teaching, research, and service. Two hundred and seventy-one faculty members responded (54.2 percent).

The study found that University of Massachusetts/ Amherst faculty did perceive instructional role differences, ranked themselves differently by percent in regard to the three dimensions included, and ranked themselves differently in certain subgroups by percent. Means from all faculty indicated that the traditional content/teacher-centered roles received the highest degree of emphasis, satisfaction, and training.

Female faculty, younger faculty, junior rank faculty, and faculty having taught on campus for less than ten years saw their instructional roles differently from male, older, senior rank faculty and those who have taught on campus ten years or more. The former indicated more familiarity with newer student-centered roles.

The faculty overwhelmingly reported teaching to be "extremely important" to them.

Based on the findings using the technique of role analysis, the following recommendations were made:

1. Develop written, audio, and videotape materials regarding instructional roles for training college professors in teaching improvement. Develop training packets classified according to skills needed for professors to take

specific instructional roles.

2. Develop in-service programs on a university-wide basis where mixed faculty groups can meet to share ideas, develop materials, and help train each other in a variety of instructional roles.
3. Incorporate classroom role analysis in the Clinic to Improve University Teaching's training of its Teaching Improvement Specialists.
4. Identify the instructional roles of each professor in a student course description guide. Develop vignettes on videotape cassettes of professors teaching and make the cassettes available to students as a further aid in course selection.
5. Disseminate slide-tape or videotape presentations of instructional role information to department chairpersons by Teaching Improvement Specialists as an outreach program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

By the late 1960s it was apparent that something significant was happening on American college and university campuses. The disenchantment of the young toward much of American life, especially the Vietnam War, was finding vehement expression in higher education. The humanism of the new culture, typified by criticism of the constraints of protocol, competition, and comparative status, began to point up the artificiality of human relationships which were based wholly on impersonal and functional lines. As Philip Slater has argued, conflict between the emerging culture of the young and that of their elders should be expected in the university.

> The best key to the kind of future we can expect is the university--the first victim of the clash between two cultures. The university is a remarkably vulnerable institution, since it lies directly in the path of the rapidly swelling ranks of the new culture yet bears a poorly concealed parasitic relationship to the old. It is thus caught in a vise--it cannot ignore the new culture as the rest of society attempts to do, yet it cannot accommodate to it without losing old culture support and going bankrupt. . . . If the universities--notoriously rigid and archaic institutions--can find ways to absorb the new culture, this augurs well for the society as a whole.[1]

Empirical evidence assessing the rate and kind of

---

[1]Philip Slater, The Pursuit of Loneliness (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), p. 148.

adaptation to the values of the new culture occurring in college classrooms are needed. Such studies can serve as barometric readings of the college climate. Using the concept of role, and faculty perceptions of its role, the present study is an attempt to gauge to what extent the instructional roles of the professor are changing.

Some in the contemporary university advocate adherence to the traditional instructional functions of the professor, while others would prefer to see the professor's role in instruction redefined, adapted, and expanded. The purpose of this study is to investigate how professors themselves see their instructional roles. It will attempt to discover the extent to which a new or adapted role definition of teaching is emerging among professors, and if it is, close attention will be paid to observing which instructional roles are gaining strength, which are remaining relatively unchanged, and which are diminishing, if any.

It is expected that those faculty trained in an earlier period in the history of higher education, which emphasized the development of character in students, formality, and hierarchical structures in the institution, department, and classrooms will often view their instructional roles rather differently from faculty educated more recently. The study is an attempt to arrive at trends and specific conclusions about the manner in which professors see themselves at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst.

Before undertaking a discussion of the actual study, the next few pages present evidence that the university as an institution both nationally and in Amherst is undergoing an important transformation.

Context of the Problem

Massachusetts has been recently described as the "epicenter" of higher education in America with no less than one hundred institutions of higher education located within its borders.[2] Among the one hundred, private institutions have tended to dominate. The excellent reputation which Massachusetts has enjoyed in higher education has generally been associated with its private colleges and universities. Institutions such as Harvard, Smith, Wellesley, Mt. Holyoke, Williams, and Amherst have distinguished the Massachusetts landscape for several centuries. The decision to support a state university of national stature and visibility in Massachusetts is of recent origin.

Both nationally and in Massachusetts expansion of an unprecedented magnitude has been occurring in higher education. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education reported:

> The most striking aspect of higher education in the United States has been the enormous expansion in enrollment, especially since World War II. From 1940 to 1970 enrollment rose 417 times as compared with the twelvefold increase in population. . . . Since World War II,

---

[2]Tufts University, Criterion, October 1974, p. 4.

> increases in college enrollments have been produced by increases in the college age population[3] and by the steady increase in the percentage of that age group entering college. Many young people have been able to enter college because of the steady increases of family income in the post-World War II period . . . increased student aid, and student loans as well as an increased supply of public higher education have been contributive factors, also.[4]

In New England alone, the total enrollment in advanced education facilities has grown from 186,429 in 1955 to 620,538 in 1973.[5]

New Learners

All Massachusetts colleges have been part of this expansion. But while the size of the privates has remained fairly constant, the size of the University of Massachusetts/Amherst, as well as the other public colleges and universities in the state system, has exploded. The expansion on the Amherst campus occurred in an even shorter time span than the post-World War II period referred to in the Carnegie

---

[3]Between 1890 and 1960 the subpopulation aged 18-24 rose slowly and irregularly by a total of 12.5 million. Yet in one decade of the 1960s there was 13.8 million increase, more than the rest of the century altogether, or 52 percent as reported in J. S. Coleman's Youth: Transition to Adulthood (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), pp. 46-47.

[4]S. Harris, "Statistical Portrait of Higher Education," in The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, ed. L. B. Mayhew (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1974), p. 356.

[5]"N.E. Student Growth Shows Rise," Daily Hampshire Gazette, 3 June 1974.

Commission report. The Amherst campus growth spurt occurred in the 1960s to the present "from a small agricultural college to a major national university with a student ceiling of 25,000."[6]

A cost comparison between the state university at Amherst and several private colleges in the state may illuminate the college decision-making of many Massachusetts families. Looking at specific institutions, we find that complete cost of one year at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst for 1973-74 was approximately $2,500.[7] In contrast to such a bargain was the 1973-74 figure for the cost of one year of resident education at an Ivy League or other private Massachusetts school such as Harvard, $5,400, or Tufts, $5,300.[8] This figure multiplied by four undergraduate years, with the added spectre of graduate school, has made private institutions out of the financial reach of many middle-class Massachusetts families of any size.

The arithmetic behind many students' college selection decisions both nationally and within Massachusetts goes something like this:

> The cost of going to a good private American college for four years is now up to $24,000. If you have a brother

---

[6]"UMass Faculty Salaries Continue Upward Push," Daily Hampshire Gazette, 17 May 1974, p. 1.

[7]"Schedule of Fee Assessment," Bursar's Office, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, January 1975.

[8]"Education," Time, 21 May 1973, p. 82.

or a sister or two who are at college age, your family's total college expense could be an astronomical $48,000 to $72,000.[9]

From a sampling of admissions data regarding class rank and estimated parental income[10] emerged the conclusion that many Massachusetts students who once filled the ranks of private colleges in Massachusetts are now being admitted to the state university at Amherst. Although the new clientele in higher education is every college's problem, the University of Massachusetts/Amherst has had to face unique problems because of its condensed period of growth as well as the unusually large number of prominent private colleges in the state.

Unlike other great state university systems, notably California, Michigan, and New York, the historical, psychological, and financial commitment to private education in Massachusetts has tended to impede the development of a strong, tax-supported public university system of higher education until the last decade.

The long-unquestioned dominance of the private colleges in the minds of Massachusetts residents is slowly eroding. The growth of the Amherst campus and its comparative enviable financial position have helped cause the privates to

---

[9]Sylvia Porter, "College Is a Good But Costly Investment," Daily Hampshire Gazette, 17 May 1974.

[10]Board of Admissions and Records Committee, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, "Annual Report 1968." (Xeroxed.) Admissions Office, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, "Profile of the Class of 1977," Fall 1973, p. 1. (Xeroxed.)

view the University of Massachusetts/Amherst as a "lion among the lambs."[11] One endangered Massachusetts private college wrote to its alumni recently: ". . . state government has entered into serious competition with the private education sector by expanding the public universities and colleges. With bargain tuition prices and financed by the taxpayer, these state institutions are intended to be all things to all people."[12]

Wave after wave of college students with neither parent or one parent having completed college (67 percent in 1972)[13] have entered the University of Massachusetts/Amherst in addition to the traditional elitist college population of the past. Institutions of higher education have taken on the responsibility of providing a college education to over half of all high school graduates in the country.[14] The increase in sheer numbers of students in post-secondary education is a fact of great import. It is evidence of the nation's attempt to fulfill an egalitarian commitment to mass education.

---

[11]W. Lauroesch and R. Keith, "Final Report, Exploratory Visits to Private Colleges in the Interest of Improved Student Mobility in Massachusetts Higher Education," University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 15 October 1974, p. 8. (Xeroxed.)

[12]Tufts University, Criterion, September 1973, p. 2.

[13]American Council on Education, Office of Research, "Summary of Data on Entering Freshmen at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Fall 1972," p. 1. (Xeroxed.)

[14]F. Newman et al., Report on Higher Education, for U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 1.

New Expectations

Charles Frankel noted in 1971:

> Thirty years ago, certainly fifty years ago, the people who went to college fell into two main categories: some were the children of the aristocrats and the rich, and the others were pushing to improve their condition in life. And each of these groups had a reason to submit to the discipline of college life and to think that their apprentice status made sense. . . . But the present generation in colleges and universities is somewhat different. A much larger number of them come from families that belong neither to a recognizable elite nor to the ranks of the disadvantaged. They are the children of well-to-do people, but they do not expect to run the country. And neither do they expect to improve very much on the performance or social position of their fathers.[15]

Frankel was suggesting that many of the students who enter college today have a rather different set of expectations from students of prior generations.

Classroom implications of the growing diversity in expectations of another segment of the new clientele in public higher education was predicted by a former Chancellor of the University of Denver. Speaking to his faculty in 1969, he said: "We will certainly have to recognize soon that our secondary schools are sending us kinds of students we never dreamed of having at the university before, and that some are ready to do the kinds of work we haven't adjusted ourselves to make it possible for them to do until their junior year."[16]

---

[15] C. Frankel, "Education in Fever," in In Defense of Academic Freedom, ed. Sidney Hook (New York: Bobbs Merrill Co., 1971), p. 38.

[16] M. Mitchell, Faculty Power and the U.S. Campus, for U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 10.

Economic Expectations

Although the economic payoff of a college education has recently been called into question by a shifting job market, Sylvia Porter, the common man's economist, wrote in her syndicated column as recently as May 1974:

> Study after study underlines that a college education is among the very best investments you can make in your entire life. It will lead to an enormous payoff in increased earnings, in brighter job prospects, and in a host of intangible cultural and social benefits for which you will always be grateful.[17]

Unfortunately, if Ms. Porter's readers focus solely on her economic promises, they may be caught in a cultural lag. A revealing picture of the college expectations of blue-collar workers for their children appeared as a constant theme in Studs Terkel's massive documentary of American workers entitled Working.[18] Over and over again in his interviews of blue-collar workers, he found American workers equating a college education with a life free from financial stress.

The Chronicle of Higher Education recently cautioned the nation against fostering unrealistic economic expectations for its college graduates. "It is simply false advertising to imply that a B.A. is the meal ticket--an automatic entry into middle management with unlimited career opportunities."[19]

---

[17]Porter, "College Is a Good But Costly Investment."

[18]Studs Terkel, Working (New York: Avon Books, 1974).

[19]"What Kind of Education, What Kind of Jobs?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, 20 January 1975, p. 7.

"Quality of Life" Expectations

A section of The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education written by Stephen Withey supported Ms. Porter's second point, however:

> . . . the college experience appears more likely than not to make students more open-minded and liberal, less concerned with material possessions, more concerned with aesthetic and cultural values, more relativistic and less moralistic but more integrated, rational and consistent. . . . Increasingly, it appears that colleges affect the individual's life style.[20]

Either the students of the University of Massachusetts/Amherst have ignored the implications of the messages emanating from the economy, or they have chosen to seek a better quality of life, or both. In any case, applications for admission to the campus were 8 percent higher for 1975 than the preceding year.[21]

Diversity

Massachusetts has been described as an ethnically plural state.[22] Plural ethnicity means wide diversity--cultural,

---

[20]S. Withey, "A Degree and What Else? Correlates and Consequences of a College Education," in The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, ed. L. B. Mayhew (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1973), pp. 392-393.

[21]A. Marx, "Recession Found Good for Higher Education," Amherst Record, 13 April 1975, p. 4.

[22]"Distribution of the Foreign Born," American History Atlas (Maplewood, N.J.: C. S. Hammond and Co., 1963), p. A-27.

religious, and racial. Such diversity in a student body inevitably means a broad array of "educative" or learning styles. Though often exhilarating, this diversity of learning styles can also be troublesome to faculty members. Robert Maynard Hutchins anticipated a faculty problem with diverse learning styles when he wrote in 1936 in reference to "the young, up to about their twentieth year": "Probably one-third of them cannot learn from books."[23] Another facet of the challenge of new learners to professors is expressed in a quotation from Ernest van der Haag, social psychologist, who wrote in 1971: "Resentment [on the part of students] is likely to become more frequent because more than 42 percent of college-age youths now attend college--while only 25 percent of the age group have the IQ (over 110) required to benefit from a college education."[24]

Even if one remains unimpressed by the claims of precision and accuracy of the IQ test purveyors, Van der Haag's point certainly has underscored an attitude privately felt by some faculty, even if rarely expressed publicly. Faculty members who persist in categorizing students on a single dimension such as IQ may view their instructional roles

---

[23]Robert Maynard Hutchins, The Higher Learning in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), p. 61.

[24]Ernest van der Haag, "The Student Seizures," in In Defense of Academic Freedom, ed. Sidney Hook (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1971), p. 48.

rather differently from those who have a more multidimensional view of their students.

Learning Style

A concept which is much more inclusive than IQ is that of "learning style." Dr. Hope Leichter points out that "an individual's educative style is learned." She went on to note:

> . . . individuals differ in the way they initiate, search for, absorb, synthesize and critically appraise various educative influences. Some individuals reach out zestfully for new experience, while others wait for opportunity to come to them. Some are playful, others more somber. Some risk embarrassment (for example, willingly trying a foreign language in public), while others play it safe. Some theorize easily, others are more concrete. Some seek perfection, others have less exacting standards of excellence. Some are gregarious; others, loners. Some learn best from listening; others from seeing or doing. Some prefer print; others prefer people or television or cinema.[25]

The notion of varied learning styles, then, serves to remind us of each learner's unique and precious individuality--which is what women, blacks, and other divergent learners have been trying to tell us all along.

Dr. Leichter suggests a dizzying assortment of factors which affect how an individual comes to possess his unique "educative style." Frequently mentioned sources from the child-rearing literature are one's family interaction, one's

---

[25]Hope Leichter, "The Concept of Educative Style," Columbia Teachers College Record, December 1973, p. 240.

community, one's subculture, and the significant others in one's life.[26] The new student body at a large public university embraces all social class levels and many ethnic origins. Van Pelt summarized classic studies of the influence of culture on education by writing:

> The data show that groups (sub-cultures) place different emphasis on the independence and achievement training in the rearing of children. Achievement motivation is more characteristic of Greeks, Jews and White Protestants than of Italians, French-Canadians and Negroes. Social class and ethnicity interact in influencing motivation, values and aspirations.[27]

A cursory reading of the Massachusetts Daily Collegian or hearing roll called in class tells one that the ethnic groups mentioned by Van Pelt and many, many others are present on the Amherst campus.

"Electronic Realities"

As if the number and type of students with immense diversity in background and learning styles were not enough, the university is also faced with another phenomenon which it must consider. James Jordan, one of the college teachers singled out by the authors of The New Teachers because of his innovative approach to the classroom, described it this way:

---

[26]Elizabeth Bing, "Effects of Child-Rearing Practices on Development of Differential Cognitive Abilities," in The Causes of Behavior, eds. A. Rosenblith and J. Allinsmith (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1970), p. 148.

[27]W. Austin Van Pelt, "Instructional Theory and Student Sub-cultures," Improving College and University Teaching 17 (Spring 1969): 116.

> What I am groping for is a pragmatic formula for a teaching-learning experience in tune with the electronic realities of our time. One doesn't have to be a confirmed McLuhanite to realize that the age of instant communication has spawned a new generation of students who think about reality in post-Gutenberg categories and who expect their education, their teachers and their academic environment to be aware of this.[28]

Marshall McLuhan, writing in 1964, predicted the power of media to influence learning styles. In fact, in an update of his book's introduction, McLuhan wrote:

> Education by classified data has been the Western program . . . . Now, however, in the electronic age, data classification yields to pattern recognition, . . . When data move instantly, classification is too fragmentary. In order to cope with data at electric speed in typical situations of "information overload," men resort to the study of configurations . . . . The young student today grows up in an electrically configured world. It is a world not of wheels but of circuits, not of fragments but of integral patterns. The student lives mythically and in depth. At school, however, he encounters a situation organized by means of classified information. The subjects are unrelated . . . . As one IBM executive puts it, "My children had lived several lifetimes compared to their grandparents when they began grade one."[29]

McLuhan was arguing that the entire information-gathering process of the learner has been drastically altered by accelerated visual and oral cues due to electronic media, notably TV. Such an argument mainly addresses changes in how intellectual processes are affected by perception.

---

[28]Don Flournoy et al., The New Teachers (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972), p. 53.

[29]M. McLuhan, Understanding Media: The Extension of Man (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964), p. vii.

"Information-Rich, Activity-Poor"

James S. Coleman in 1974 chaired a study group which concurred with McLuhan that today's learners are indeed different, but this group cited other causes.[30] Their report documented the socialization, enculturation, and transition of the young in an earlier, more rural, and more leisurely era in our country's history. The report reached the conclusion that the narrow cognitive emphasis of our educational institutions, though perfectly acceptable in prior times, is bankrupt for the learners of today. In an earlier article Coleman had characterized our electronic age as being "information-rich and activity-poor,"[31] as contrasted with other historical periods. Both writings have urged our educational institutions to develop new roles for students in addition to an expansion of some of the old roles to provide an education which makes sense for our times.

Student vs. Faculty Goals

Another problem area resulting from the influx of new student populations is the irreconcilability which sometimes occurs between faculty and student goals. With the few viable options open to the eighteen-year-olds in our culture, many

---

[30]James S. Coleman, Youth: Transition to Adulthood (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).

[31]James S. Coleman, "The Children Have Outgrown the Schools," Psychology Today, February 1972, pp. 72-82.

students enter college with personal and interpersonal rather than academic growth in mind. Bruno Bettelheim has pointed out:

> What they do want, essentially, is group therapeutic experiences to help them to mature, to be secure, to find themselves. But since colleges and universities are not mass therapeutic institutions, they disappoint the students where their greatest need lies.[32]

One of the "side effects," if you will, of being in a college environment is the nonacademic opportunities which exist for the kinds of experiences needed by young people for their personal growth and development (witness the phenomenon of the "nonstudent" population which often magically appears in a university community because of the presence of such opportunities).

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education noted:

> The implied preoccupation with the intellect (in college) may be inconsistent with some of the postulates emanating from developmental psychology. It may be also inconsistent with historical reality, which showed that much of the development during the college years was affective and brought about through extracurricular, rather than through rationally coordinated curriculum.[33]

Thus, in Jacques Barzun's words, for many "going to college is a social, much more than a vocational preparation";[34] and faculty goals for their students are often

---

[32]Bruno Bettelheim, "The Anatomy of Student Discontent," in In Defense of Academic Freedom, ed. Sidney Hook (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1971), p. 65.

[33]L. B. Mayhew, ed., The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1973), p. 62.

[34]Jacques Barzun, The American University (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 22.

antithetical to those the students themselves hold. Faculty members who persist in viewing student goals as synonymous with their own goals for students may view their instructional roles rather differently from those who have a less one-sided view of student goals.

Student vs. Faculty Orientations

Furthermore, the problem of antithetical goals of students and faculty is exacerbated by differences in orientation. One faculty member on the Amherst campus explained it this way:

> Related to the issue of faculty vs. student goals are the differences in the academic training of both groups. Relative to their students, the faculty are a highly homogeneous group. They have all been trained for at least four intensive years beyond the BA level to be "experimental-research scientists" (e.g., Proshansky, 1972). This training emphasizes (and their profession rewards) cognitive (vs. affective), written (vs. spoken), quantitative (vs. qualitative), abstract (vs. applied), theoretically derived (vs. intuitively developed), and objective (vs. subjective) approaches to learning. The ways in which this training is reflected in each of the courses are abundant and obvious. For instance, almost all evaluation in these courses is based upon written work. Similarly, the majority of the materials which students study are written theoretical presentations of abstract concepts supported or critiqued by quantitative data. Students, particularly in introductory courses, vary tremendously in the extent to which they share the faculty's orientation to learning. Clearly, many of them do not; and even among those who do, probably a fairly small percentage regularly use such an approach to learning when unpressured by the requirements of academia. When these differences between students and faculty are considered together with the differences in their learning goals, we should not be surprised to find less student involvement than faculty would like.[35]

---

[35]W. B. Dorris, "Alternative Approaches to Teaching

To recapitulate, certain conclusions seem warranted from the preceding discussion of diversity in higher education: new and diverse college populations are bringing to the University of Massachusetts/Amherst and elsewhere a heterogeneity of learning styles, goals, and orientations acquired from many sources. These, in turn, are bringing about a kind of crisis of expectations.

Way back in 1850 the president of the University of Michigan wailed, "We have cheapened education so as to place it within the reach of everyone."[36] One can only speculate at his disillusionment were he to visit his own and other state universities today. Clearly, a new milieu is evolving in higher education generally, and at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst, specifically.

Concern for Teaching Improvement

Pressures upon colleges and universities to improve their teaching come from a myriad of sources both inside and outside higher education. These pressures derive from new tasks and new clientele, which in turn bring about new expectations.

Large Undergraduate Psychology Courses: Going beyond Information-giving," Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, Fall 1974, p. 7. (Xeroxed.)

[36]Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), p. 63.

A 1974 Ohio Wesleyan University study reported "participation in faculty evaluation and the quality of teaching and the curriculum"[37] as ranking fifth in a list of ten issues perceived by college deans across the nation as being of high interest to present college students.

Student discontent of the 1960s has added several allies to its call for classroom reform.

> Colleges and universities throughout the country are more concerned with the improvement of instruction than at any previous time in history. The problems of escalating costs, student dissatisfaction with the impersonalized university, and public demand for faculty accountability have contributed to this concern for teaching improvement.[38]

The development of educational alternatives adds to the pressures for improving college teaching. "With decreases in enrollment and increases in such alternative educational avenues as external degree programs, proprietary institutions and CLEP, the college professor must be able to present courses that are meaningful and instructionally attractive."[39]

A national movement toward accountability in higher

---

[37]E. Birch, J. Brandt, R. Heath, and R. Southwick, "Campus Environment '74," NASPA Called (Delaware: Ohio Wesleyan University, 1974), p. 3.

[38]Daniel S. Sheehan, "Faculty Attitudes towards Evaluation and Teaching Improvement," paper prepared for the Clinic to Improve University Teaching, School of Education, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1974, p. 1. (Xeroxed.)

[39]W. Berquist and S. Phillips, "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program," Journal of Higher Education 46 (March/April 1975): 181.

education is upon us, also.

> The period of adolescent growth is over. What has been lost, irretrievably, is the virtual immunity to public scrutiny and criticism that higher education enjoyed in the era following World War II. The age of innocence is past. The myths must be penetrated, the realities faced honestly, and the possibilities and options weighed carefully.[40]

Public institutions of higher education which are funded by the taxpayer, like the University of Massachusetts, are particularly vulnerable to the accountability movement because

> . . . the legislatures are feeling the general pinch caused by inflation and the rival needs of welfare. Besides, faculty salaries have reached a point where legislators, rightly or wrongly, are beginning to lose sympathy with "the underpaid college teacher." They compare his salary and workload with theirs, they think of the three-month vacation and the opportunities for outside consulting, and they are puzzled by the expensive cross-country bidding and switching. Articles in business journals that they read take for granted "the affluent professor."[41]

Background of the larger crisis in higher education has been included because of its ultimate and predictable impact in the college classroom. The forecast of a problem on the Amherst campus was alluded to by David Riesman and Christopher Jencks as early as 1962. They hinted at potential faculty role ambiguity due to unclear goals:

> Up to the present, the University of Massachusetts has not had to decide what its particular educational mission

---

[40]James Davis, "Review of Higher Education: Myths and Realities," Journal of Higher Education, November 1973, p. 659.

[41]Barzun, The American University, p. 70.

> is, since it can continue to battle against the indifference of the public and the undercover jealousy of private competitors. For some, it may be enough to bring public education to "backward" New England, while keeping an eye on the models of private academic respectability. But others on the faculty are more ambitious or venturesome. . . . As a state university, charged with "residue" junctions, the University of Massachusetts/Amherst cannot shed its vocational aspects--nor should it seek to do so. What it can do, and what it is doing, is to add to these the emphasis on the liberal arts that traditionally accompanies a rise in social and academic standing.[42]

And now twelve years later, Chancellor Bromery in his opening address to the four campus governance units on 19 September 1974 called for a definition of future goals:

> It is clear that we are at the end of our growth era and we must set about defining our institutional goals in the context of the present and future societal needs and expectations. . . . the message sent by the legislature is painfully clear. They don't hear us, understand us, or believe us.[43]

Subjective Experience of Investigation

Direct experience as a Teaching Improvement Specialist in the Clinic to Improve University Teaching at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst led this writer to the observation that differing role expectations and role perceptions of faculty do exist. The awareness came from four

---

[42]David Riesman and Christopher Jencks, "The Viability of the American College," in The American College, ed. Nevitt Sanford (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962), pp. 146-147.

[43]Donna Fusco, "Chancellor Bromery: UMass Goals Must Be Defined," Massachusetts Daily Collegian, 19 September 1974, p. 1.

sources. Many analytical discussions with faculty clients regarding teaching effectiveness allowed the writer an opportunity to hear that faculty often define their teaching responsibility in limited ways. An analysis of over fifty computer printouts in depth which contained comparisons of faculty and student questionnaire data suggested a problem. An analysis of a summary of 810 computer printouts containing student questionnaire data was further evidence. Analysis and interpretation of more than fifty videotapes of classroom teaching allowed the writer an opportunity to see that students often view the teaching role differently from their professors. These differing perceptions provided enough of a discrepancy for the writer to be convinced that a problem existed.

Concurring with the writer's experience, Kenneth Eble wrote: "In my discussions with students and faculty, regardless of the calibre of the school I was visiting, there seemed to be a constant distance between student perceptions and faculty perceptions on many aspects of teaching and learning."[44] A course in symbolic interaction alerted the researcher to frame the problem in terms of misperceived roles and how this, in turn, leads to misperceived role expectations. An important symbolic interaction term,

---

[44]K. Eble, Professors as Teachers (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972), p. 146.

"definition of the situation,"[45] seemed to shed light on the topic. Because the faculty's definition traditionally has tended to prevail, how faculty members "define the situation" seemed like a good place to start.

The Purpose of the Study

Any attempt to improve university teaching must first address itself to determining just how faculty members do perceive their role in instruction. If faculty members do not perceive the instructional roles as students do then such divergent expectations will continue to contribute to student apathy and the misuse of university resources.

This study attempts (1) to investigate empirically faculty perceptions of their instructional roles at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst and (2) to identify the role perceptions of specific subgroupings of that faculty.

The long-range purpose of this study is to provide first-level baseline information about faculty role perceptions as a means of informing the faculty development effort at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst.

Summary

The preceding overview indicates that both new

---

[45]Peter McHugh, Defining the Situation (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1968). For a full discussion of this term, see chap. ii, p. 49.

learners and environmental factors are simultaneously having an impact on higher education. Chapter II will discuss the importance of yet another factor--the new tasks of education resulting from different assumptions about knowledge.

Because the university is the only institution which emerged in medieval times and has persisted in its original form until the present, some claim that colleges and universities are, like dinosaurs, doomed to extinction. Others recognize that the future of an educational institution rests on how well it meets the needs of both its students and the society in which it exists. As society changes and the needs, interests, and abilities of entering students change, so must the instructional processes be revised. Many college classrooms are based more on tradition than on a realistic appraisal of student needs. The future of educational institutions may depend ultimately on how well they can restructure, within the next few years, both what they do and how they do it. An analysis and identification of faculty role perceptions can bring some understanding of where to direct improvement efforts.

Limitations to the Study

Limitations to the study include the following:

1. The present study was restricted to the period from March

---

[46] R. Nisbet, The Degradation of the Academic Dogma: The University in America, 1945-1970 (New York: Basic Books, 1971), pp. 1-22.

1974 to May 1974. Therefore, generalities deduced from this short time period may be particularly influenced by events on the University of Massachusetts/Amherst campus during this period.

2. The investigator was personally involved in the study and her bias may be reflected.
3. The questionnaire used to survey the faculty may lack precision because of language or the ambiguity of some roles.
4. Because of the unique developmental factors of the University of Massachusetts/Amherst cited in Chapter I, the findings may not be generalizable beyond this campus.
5. The self-report data from faculty may yield information biased toward "acceptable" responses.
6. Nonrespondents were not polled to determine whether or not the respondents represent an unrepresentative population.

Organization of the Dissertation

The dissertation has been organized into seven chapters. Following this opening chapter introducing the problem is a survey of the educational, historical, humanistic, and social psychological perspectives of the professorial role. The third chapter reviews empirical research on university teaching and the professor. The fourth chapter explains the methodology and the fifth presents an analysis of the findings of this study. The sixth chapter is a discussion of

the data. The seventh and final chapter contains a summary and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

EDUCATIONAL, HISTORICAL, HUMANISTIC, AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

Outside of the college classroom a number of societal forces occur concomitantly and have impact inside the classroom. The exact nature of that interaction cannot be specified as yet. Mention should be made, nonetheless, of those influences which are thought to be involved, despite our current inability to state the relationships exactly. To that end, three perspectives are presented in this chapter. An educational perspective is included to demonstrate how new teaching tasks result from the different assumptions which underlie process education. Second, a brief history of the modern university in the United States is given to help explain particular developments which influenced the professorial role and continue to influence that role. Third, a humanistic psychological perspective is presented in an effort to assess the contribution to the current university mood of the new humanistic movement among American young people. An additional perspective, that of social psychology, is provided as a justification and explanation of role analysis as a method of inquiry.

Educational Perspective

As American education moved into the 1960s, a rash of writers often described by the sobriquet "romantic critics" began to document their disenchantment with traditional American education. Such writers as Paul Goodman, John Holt, Jonathan Kozal, Herbert Kohl, N. Postman and C. Weingartner, and Charles Silberman found themselves agreeing with much of what David Riesman, Edgar Freidenberg, Kenneth Keniston, Jules Henry, Alvin Toffler, Philip Slater, and others had written about American culture. Clearly, the notion of an educated person and the education needed to turn out such a person was being called into question.

New Tasks

Our accelerated technological era had witnessed the phenomenon of a tremendous knowledge explosion and dissemination accompanied by a simultaneous knowledge obsolescence. The centuries-old ideal of the Renaissance or universal man who was at home in the factual information of disciplines was no longer an appropriate model for education. Jerome Bruner and the group of scientists who met at Woods Hole in the late 1950s had anticipated the obsolescence of the Renaissance model.[1] They called for an education with a heavier emphasis

---

[1]Jerome Bruner, The Process of Education (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961).

on the processes of thinking rather than on the sheer accumulation of facts.

Looking at education as a process rather than a product represented an important shift of emphasis which generated a vast amount of research in the decade which followed.

Empirical Basis for Process Education

Henry Cole published a book in 1972 which pulled together much of the thinking that had been generated from the new focus. Like most ideas whose time has come, it became evident that a number of researchers were coming to the same conclusions about education. But they were calling their areas of study something else. How others have chosen to categorize their research was noted by Cole in the following passage:

> Gagné has referred to them as "learned capabilities" [1968], "intellectual skills" [1968], statements of "what the individual can do" [1968], "intellectual operations" [1968], and "processes" and "intellectual activities" [1965]. Newell, Shaw, and Simon [1958] call them "processes" and equate them to Bruner's strategies [1956, 1966]. Bruner also calls them [1969] "skills" and "intellectual habits" [1968, 1970]. Crutchfield [1969] calls them "skills." Andreas refers to them as "psychological processes" [1968]. Skinner [1968] calls them "self-management behaviors." Williams [1968, 1969, 1970] has called them "processes." They are also the "process competencies" which underlie Heathers' [1965] "process goals." They are Worthen's "processes in education" [1963]. They are the "affective and social interactive processes and skills" essential for learning and problem-solving that are discussed so frequently by Rogers [1961, 1962], Combs [1962], Kelley [1962], Maslow [1962], Bettelheim [1969], Brandwein [1969], Fox, Lippitt,

and Girault [1969], Lippitt, Fox, and Schaible [1969], Meade [1969], Rubin [1969], and Lippitt [1970]. They can be considered the taxonomic categories of cognitive functioning of Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill, and Krathwohl [1956] or the categories of affective functioning of Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia [1964]. They may also be considered the "operations" of Guilford [1967], the "logical operations" of Piaget [1958, 1966], and the "abilities in thinking" of Russell [1956]. These and many other researchers have studied, enumerated, and discussed skills and processes in relation to education for effective living.[2]

The questions researchers were asking about cognition were the same. Someone only needed to apply an appropriate name to the various inquiries. Cole chose the term "process education" to provide semantic clarity.

Process Education

What is "process education"? It is concerned first and foremost with the facilitation and development of skills. Skills are the organizations of behaviors which are highly transferable. The skills which are most frequently emphasized in process education are those which relate to learning and analytic, productive, and expressive thinking. Other important skills which are less frequently emphasized are those concerned more directly with emotion, motivation, values, and interpersonal relationships.

Although the notion of process education is as old as Socrates, its emphasis at this time in history indicates the

---

[2]Henry Cole, Process Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1972), pp. 29-30.

need for a realignment of educational priorities. Cole wrote:

> The skills are the goals. The curriculum content is the vehicle by which the goal of skill development may be realized. . . . In the current practice of education, too much emphasis is placed on information and bodies of knowledge. Too little emphasis is placed upon facilitating the skills for dealing with that information, as well as the huge amount of information resulting from personal experience. . . . People do not live for information. The information is needed, but without the skills the person is crippled.[3]

In building a case for process education, Cole has juxtaposed the value positions of conventional educational practice against the value positions of process education in a chart reproduced here in toto (see Figure 1).

Note Cole's four critical value positions on the left in the figure. Three focus on the nature of knowledge, learning, and the learner, and the fourth, on the function of the school. Cole suggested that the bedrock assumptions of education from which all else has been derived as being the problems. If the very assumptions and premises upon which current education rests are obsolete, then the tasks following from those assumptions must inevitably be obsolete, also. A reformulation of the basic premises of education must occur.

Alfred North Whitehead had forecast the resistance that would surely follow on the heels of such a shift. In 1929 he noted:

---

[3]Ibid., pp. 4-5.

Fig. 1. Opposed value positions underlying process and conventional educational practice.*

Knowledge is	- absolute and true
	+ tentative and arbitrary
Learning is	- unnatural and difficult
	+ natural and enjoyable
The Learner is	- a humble and passive recipient of knowledge and experience
	+ an aggressive and active seeker of knowledge and experience
The School is	- the authoritative transmitter of established values and knowledge
	+ the setting for emergence of values and knowledge through inquiry

*The value positions consistent with the justifications and assumptions of process education are indicated by a plus (+) sign. The opposed and prevailing value for current educational practice is indicated by a minus (-) sign. The desired direction of change for the implementation of process education is indicated by an arrow.

Source: Henry Cole, Process Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1972), p. 103.

> Any serious fundamental change in the intellectual outlook of human society must necessarily be followed by an educational revolution. It may be delayed for a generation by vested interests or by the passionate attachment of some leaders of thought to the cycle of ideas within which they received their own mental stimulus at an impressionable age. But the law is inexorable that education to be living and effective must be directed to informing pupils with those ideas, and to creating for them those capacities which will enable them to appreciate the current thought of their epoch.[4]

---

[4]A. N. Whitehead, The Aims of Education (New York: Free Press, 1967), p. 77.

Bruner, in an article written ten years after the publication of The Process of Education, commented on the student upheaval in the Western world "from Berkeley to Columbia through the Harvard bust and the Sorbonne riots to the Prague spring and summer"[5] and saw the battle cry for "relevance" as a thread running through all these events. Relevance refers to the process of education. Perhaps the turmoil currently occurring in higher education could be viewed as evidence of Whitehead's wisdom.

The process education movement, with its realignment of emphasis from facts to skills, is consonant with all those who argue for a wider approach to education. An education which has the transmission and recall of factual knowledge as its main purpose is not attending to the other needs which have been identified for successful human development.

Historical Perspective

The role of the professor has undergone important transformations traceable to historical changes within the university itself. The images which have fed cultural expectations of the professorial role were based on prior faculty functions. The origins of these functions are outlined in the historical perspective which follows. As in most historical developments, there are complex and subtle causes and

---

[5]J. Bruner, "The Process of Education Revisited," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1971, p. 19.

effects. Institutions and individual professors make decisions which are laden with precedent about that pastiche of functions we call the professorial role. Historically, the possible shifts and redistributions of emphasis within the professoriate come from separate Western European university progenitors, even though their "origin was obscure and almost unnoticed"[6] in medieval history. The three most prominent models are explained below.

Western European Models

The "Oxbridge" (Oxford-Cambridge) model, inherited from England,[7] was based on language. "It intended to cultivate a quality of mind and to contribute to the habits of thinking of the gentleman."[8] The liberal arts tradition with its aim as enrichment of the mind had a special mission in England: to educate the aristocracy and the clergy.

A second model originated in the Scottish universities.[9] Their goal was to teach subjects in order to impart useful knowledge to any layman qualified to learn. It

---

[6]Whitehead, The Aims of Education, p. 95.

[7]Talcott Parsons and Gerald Platt, "Introduction: The Structure of the Academic Professions," Sociology of Education 47 (Winter 1974): 25.

[8]Campbell Stewart, "The Place of Higher Education in a Changing Society," in The American College, ed. Nevitt Sanford (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962), p. 918.

[9]Parsons and Platt, "Introduction," p. 26.

paralleled the rise of a large middle class of merchants and businessmen. "This development can be designated as a sort of secularization process in which higher education became deeply concerned with practical affairs, while the older clerical and classical emphasis was largely superseded."[10]

A third, the German university tradition,[11] emphasized scientific training and scientifically conditioned research to expand knowledge. A trend to empirical thought, a concern with things and processes, with forces and measurements, meant an increased range of subjects in the sciences. It "led in one direction to expanded interpretations of the traditional liberal arts and in the other, to the emphasis on research, one of the chief consequences of which was the later development of the graduate schools."[12]

American colleges and universities from colonial times to the present evolved mainly from these older Western European university traditions. Thus, before this century began, not just one but at least three models existed of the academic, the institutions in which he/she worked and the relationship of those institutions to the rest of society.

---

[10]Robert Knapp, "Changing Functions of the Professor," in The American College, ed. Nevitt Sanford (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962), p. 293.

[11]Parsons and Platt, "Introduction," p. 27.

[12]Stewart, "The Place of Higher Education in a Changing Society," p. 923.

Developments in American Universities

Once American colleges were established, they became subject to changes occurring both on the continent and unique to America. Three changes that were to have great impact on the young institutions of America came about in the 1800s. The first one--the rise of state-supported institutions of higher education--was peculiarly American. The fluid society emerging in America coincided with the tradition of vocationalism quite naturally. This happy union was reflected in the Morrill Act of 1862. "It became one junction of the university movement in America to blur the distinction which had long existed between the connotation of profession and that of vocation."[13]

The second change occurred during the latter half of the nineteenth century when natural science came into its own at the university. This mirrored a similar development in Germany. The college atmosphere changed from that of an intimate college to a university.

The third change in the latter half of the nineteenth century was the overthrow of the fixed curriculum for an elective system. This change was accompanied by a further growth of natural science, the concept of departmentalization, and a proliferation of specialized courses.

These changes led to other developments which could

---

[13]Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 339.

be described as a general growing bureaucratization of the college teaching profession. Paraphrased below are modifications of the university in America which have led to the current status of the professor as identified by Robert Knapp.[14]

Knapp cited the decline of the character-developing function of faculty accompanied by a concomitant decline in the professors' influence in the management of university affairs due to political leanings of faculty members which were considered to be to the left of the managerial class. The growth of an administrative bureaucracy of deans, associate deans, provosts, etc., who managed the university in a more businesslike way was a related development. The institutional loyalty of professors continued to fragment due to an upsurge in a number of national discipline-oriented professional societies, and faculty identification with these societies. The proliferation of the professor's "union card," the Ph.D. (only four hundred in the United States in 1900) was also cited as a contributing factor in the bureaucratization of the university. In addition, there occurred a new emphasis on the doctrine of academic freedom which promoted a sense of security and dignity among the faculty. Knapp identified the new importance attached to research and publication for faculty success as leading to a new role for the

---

[14]Knapp, "Changing Functions of the Professor," pp. 290-311.

professor, that of consultant to government and industry.

Unfortunately, these developments have often been at the expense of good teaching. The following passage, which described the university's faculty reward system, is one area where contemporary students can agree with faculty:

> Compared to the prestige and recognition, monetary as well as intangible, attaching to scholarly attainment, the few awards for distinguished teaching are pathetic . . . . These are very small crumbs indeed compared to the overwhelming recognition given to publication, research and even administrative performance . . . . Probably at the present time the informational function is competing for prestige at severe disadvantage with the research function.[15]

Kenneth Eble summarized today's faculty functions at the conclusion of his 1971 nationwide study in these words: "There is no argument within the profession about the broad responsibilities of a faculty member. Scholarship, teaching and service are accepted almost everywhere as the major ones."[16]

Such a brief historical outline can barely hope to suggest some of the causes which might lead to the present confusion and dissatisfaction surrounding university teaching. These multiple role dimensions of being a university faculty member today--teaching, research, and service--tell us something about the kinds of choices a faculty member must make when limited by his/her own finite skills, energy, and time.

---

[15] Ibid., p. 398.

[16] Eble, Professors as Teachers, p. 85.

Only one particular dimension of the professor's role will be studied here: the instructional dimension. The professorial role, in general, will be examined only briefly to see if the University of Massachusetts/Amherst faculty reports the usual faculty rank-ordering of roles which is (1) research, (2) teaching, and (3) service.

The background offered above suggests that the streams of history and education are converging to affect college classrooms. Shifts in values held by young people originating in the humanistic psychology movement represent a third stream which is making an additional impact.

Humanistic Psychological Perspective

As the twentieth century enters its final quarter, we are witnessing an important development in psychological thought. Like the mythological Phoenix bird rising from the ashes of schools of thought made dead by new findings which cannot be accounted for with old theories, a new synthesis is taking place. Research from a variety of sources--psychotherapy, existential psychology, brain-injured soldiers, psychoanalysis, motivation and creativity studies, and human development--has raised havoc with prior, more narrow psychological theories. The behavioral school of psychological thought believes that, in being conditioned by his environment, "man is what you make him."[17] The psychoanalytic

[17]For a full description of the behaviorist's

approach[18] views man as a creature impulsively engaging in a constant process of drive reduction, with id forces and superego demands often effectively compromising the development of a rational and socially rewarding ego structure.

Humanists assert that people are motivated by an intrinsic desire for growth--a pull to the future.[19] Freed from incapacitating external and historical constraints, one's potential to grow as a loving, productive, functional person is manifested. The process of becoming, rather than a specifically defined goal, is viewed as an ultimate objective in itself. Such a process is not static; one's optimal growth is dependent upon constant personal experience directed toward self-actualization.

How does a humanistic perspective relate to role? Michael Giammateo made the following connection, drawing heavily from Maslow's "Hierarchy of Needs":[20]

> Values, needs and role structure are related. The The basic needs of human beings have been classified by Maslow at five levels: (1) biological necessity, e.g., food, water, oxygen; (2) safety; (3) love and acceptance; (4) self-esteem and recognition from others; and (5)

---

psychological theory, see the works of B. F. Skinner.

[18]For a full description of psychoanalytic theory, see the works of Sigmund Freud.

[19]For a full description of the humanistic psychological theory, see the works of Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers.

[20]Abraham Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1954).

> self-actualization and self-realization. Role structure is related to status positions which permit individuals to secure basic needs. The status position is a series of rights and duties; role is the way in which duties are carried out. Role is tied to value judgment. Roles are played because they help regulate behavior, they help one interact with others and they help an individual to note role variance. Role structures create conflicts when duties and rights are not clearly defined or when a society's structure changes.[21]

While a student at Delhi University in India, this writer noticed a marked contrast in the role expectations of faculty and students to those encountered in the 1970s at American universities. A traditional, nonaffluent culture such as the one found in India drew rigid and clear role lines. The writer was struck by the similarity of the Indian student-faculty roles and those experienced as an undergraduate two decades ago in the United States.

The loosening up of older and tighter status classifications (and the accompanying role behavior) of male/female, black/white, old/young, rich/poor, public person/private person, mother/father, deviant/normal, mentally ill/mentally healthy, etc., has been touched on in a number of contemporary works.[22] Universities also reflect the broad

---

[21]Michael Giammateo, "Suggested Activities for Learning about Role Behavior, Problem-Solving and Force Field Techniques," paper for the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon, 1969, p. 1.

[22]For a full description of role realignment, see the writings of Gordon Allport, Joseph Axelrod, Judith Bardwick, Joseph Fletcher, Paul Goodman, Thomas Harris, Ken Kesey, David Matza, Abraham Maslow, Postman and Weingartner, Thomas Szasz, Charles Reich, Carl Rogers, and Alvin Toffler.

and sweeping changes going on in society. Thus, to this list of role behaviors undergoing change, we add those of student/teacher. Our society is, and will continue to be, too complicated to be organized on rigid lines of unidimensional role behavior. As humanism and futurism flourish, it should follow that the growth-enhancing roles of a "collectivized individual"[23] will be needed.

Rationale for the New Humanism

American society's exaggerated commitment to individualism was the most important single reason given by Philip Slater for the recent flourishing of the new humanism among the young. He wrote:

> . . .community, engagement, dependency--can all trace their suppression in American society to our commitment to individualism. The belief that everyone should pursue autonomously his own destiny has forced us to maintain an emotional detachment (for which no amount of superficial gregariousness can compensate) from our social and physical environment, and aroused a vague guilt about our competitiveness and indifference to others; for, after all, our earliest training in childhood does not stress competitiveness, but cooperation, sharing and thoughtfulness--it is only later that we learn to reverse these priorities. Radical challenges to our society, then, always tap a confused responsive chord within us that is far more disturbing than anything going on outside. They threaten to connect us with each other, with nature, and with ourselves, a possibility that is thrilling but terrifying--as if we had grown a shell-like epidermis and someone was threatening to rip it off.

---

[23]Irving Buchen, "Humanism and Futurism: Enemies or Allies?" in Learning for Tomorrow, ed. Alvin Toffler (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), p. 137.

> Individualism finds its roots in the attempt to deny the reality and importance of human interdependence.[24]

Later on, Slater spoke of the contemporary "battle between social forms and human feeling."[25]

A popularization of the complex role destruction/reconstruction process in American life was authored by Charles Reich. Though many scholars would probably concur with one reviewer's judgment that Reich was writing "parables for rich penitents"[26] and ignoring nagging social problems, his book, written after long discussions with students, offers insight into the current national university scene.

Reich gave a picture of the life of a university faculty member in 1970:

> The basic task of a teacher is to teach students. But many teachers serve administrative purposes. College teachers have endless committee and faculty meetings devoted to such problems as new appointments, promotions, curriculum and admissions. They attend panel discussions, symposia, give speeches, and participate in professional conventions in many parts of the country and even in foreign countries. Their advice or assistance is sought by outside organizations ranging from presidential commissions to local community groups. And, above all, they are continuously engaged in "research and publication," activities that require a half or a third of any college teacher's time.[27]

---

[24]Philip Slater, The Pursuit of Loneliness (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), pp. 25-26.

[25]Ibid., p. 54.

[26]Maxine Greene, review of The Greening of America by Charles Reich in Columbia Teachers College Record 2 (May 1971), 505-512.

[27]Charles Reich, The Greening of America (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 126.

What happens to teaching and a personal concern for students when universities and colleges emphasize the product and not the process? Reich went on to say:

> It is clear that there has been a substitution of one kind of work for another. Has there been a loss in the process? We first ask the question from the teacher's point of view. We put to one side the professional prestige he gets, the salary he receives, the status he achieves in the society. In accordance with the McLuhan principle we are interested in the work itself. Committees represent little gain. They supply neither the satisfaction of creative work nor appealing personal relationships. Panel discussions, travel and professional gatherings offer new places and new people. But the trips are hasty and tiring, the contact, both with places and with people, tends to be superficial and nonrepeating, and it is hard to see how such excursions, however diverting, could be central to anyone's working life. As for "research and publication," what most college teachers now do is simply a different thing altogether. More like a Ph.D. dissertation than anything else, it is artificial writing, often published before the teacher has anything he wants to say. Usually it disappears into the graveyard of a dull and dusty scholarly publication; the author will be lucky if he gets one or two letters from people who have read it; it can hardly be said he is communicating with any audience, professional or otherwise. In short, except for the teacher who has a truly creative moment, the stuff of his working life will be impersonal, frustrating and unsatisfying.[28]

Clearly, the person who chose to become a college teacher because he/she welcomed the enormous demand on one's creativity and spontaneity must suffer.

Charles Reich's revealing scenario documents professorial roles which <u>are</u>. Evolved in concert with the growth of colleges and universities in America, some roles seem clearly out of step with the mood of the times. The

---

[28] <u>Ibid</u>.

resurgence of humanism with its concurrent emphasis on the self and human feelings seems to anticipate the demise of some aspects of the professorial role and the emergence of new ones.

Older content and teacher-centered roles have focused on telling the student what to learn and how to go about learning it. Newer roles incorporate the older content goals with the goal of social and emotional development. These roles encourage students to explore how certain people feel about the student and how the student feels about them and the course content. In the classroom such teaching roles would be organized around the principle of collaboration, not competition; interdependence and the distribution of expertise and power, rather than a hierarchical structure.

This study will look at whether the University of Massachusetts/Amherst faculty has perceived the emergence of new roles in response to the resurgence of humanism.

Social Psychological Perspective

In this section the working concepts employed in the study are outlined, and in the next chapter, pertinent research on the professorial role is investigated.

Even though researchers have been studying university teaching for a long time and have thoroughly examined characteristics, methods, objectives, and teaching behaviors, they have found very little information to assist in the

improvement of college instruction. There still appears to be a missing ingredient. Increasingly, researchers are looking at role as a possible organizing concept.

Role theory provides a framework that directs the study of a role along many avenues. It should be recognized that the designation "role theory" does not presuppose a tightly developed theoretical stance. In fact, there is considerable disagreement even on the definition of role itself. This vagueness continues to plague works dealing with the role concept.

Despite the fact that real-life situations are not acted out according to a script or other rigid prescription, human interaction may be conceived of in terms of the dramatic model with its accompanying notions of actors playing parts, social situations, or scenes plot script (or a prescription for concerted action), and a certain degree of improvisation that may take place within the parts. This particular model has been highly influential in sociology, anthropology, and social psychology. It has been used implicitly or casually by historians and other social scientists for many generations.

To quote social psychologists Lindesmith and Strauss:

> Anthropologists and sociologists who have been interested in communication and the interrelationships of institutions have needed a term to indicate the relation of individual activities to the larger organization of

> society. Hence they have linked "role" with institutional terms like "status," "position," and "office."[29]

A brief description of role, intended as a rationale for the usefulness of the concept of role to indicate a general approach to behavior, follows. For this study, role theory is used to indicate an approach to a specific segment of a professor's behavior (i.e., university classroom teaching).

Role Theory

Role is the dynamic aspect of status. The rights and duties which constitute a status become a role when put into effect. Individuals, not automatons, perform roles. This gives them their dynamic aspect. The amount of variation exhibited by individuals even within the most institutionalized of roles makes necessary the distinction between role in a normative sense and role performance. The performance is affected by differential perceptions of a situation. The normative representations of role are assumed to typify abstractly accepted descriptions of positions in society. Role is a process. One constructs individualized role performances from what one believes is called for in that role, together with one's own idiosyncratic acts. Role-making can be a highly energizing endeavor for creative people.

---

[29] A. Lindesmith and A. Strauss, Social Psychology (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968), p. 276.

George Herbert Mead postulated about how a child takes on roles by means of "significant others"--family, playmates--all those who are important for forming a self-concept. With the assumption and acquisition of new roles throughout life, the individual is influenced by various sets of significant and reference others. If we know who has been and who is significant to a person's self-image, we know a great deal about that person.[30]

Strongly agreeing with Mead's ideas, several psychologists have used the concept of reference and significant others to speculate about intrapsychic processes that accompany the cumulative interactive process of role-taking. Albert Bandura placed great importance on the imitative value of role models in his theory of social learning.[31] R. D. Laing, another psychologist, suggested that significant others whose power was perceived as disproportionate to the developing child were the etiology of certain psychopathologies.

Laing commented on the perceptually complex milieu which accompanies the normative aspects of the role-making process:

> A person does not act or experience himself in a vacuum. He is not the only agent in his world. How he perceives

---

[30]G. H. Mead, "Genesis of Self," in The Self in Social Interaction, eds. Chad Gordon and Kenneth Gergen (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1968), p. 58.

[31]A. Bandura and R. Walters, Social Learning and Personality Development (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963).

> and acts toward the others, how they perceive and act toward him, and how they perceive him as perceiving them, etc., are all aspects of "the situation" pertinent to an adequate understanding of the person's total participation in it.[32]

In real life, a person may identify with real as well as with fictional and mass media others. A professor will be influenced by professors and college settings to which he has been exposed in his/her prior experience as a student and by what he/she has read and heard about professors.

Definition of the Situation

Another concept from social psychology is central to a discussion on role theory. That concept is "definition of the situation." Playing a role occurs in episodes, scenes, or situations. In a college classroom there exists a number of different definitions of the situation. Each individual present must recognize, name, and catalogue the experience he/she is undergoing in order for appropriate action to be undertaken. No two situations are ever exactly alike, but there is often enough resemblance between the situation and prior situations to permit recognition and thus to give rise to orderly and regular behavior. Most often classroom situations seem to be routine, traditional, and familiar for both faculty and students. Occasionally, they are problematic and

---

[32]R. D. Laing, The Self and Others (London: Tavistock Press, 1961), p. 70.

subject to different interpretations. All situations, both familiar and new, involve the interpretation of a multitude of cues. The situation is not merely a physical inventory of external data but is affected by one's customary selection of those parts to which attention is drawn. These parts are selected on the basis of one's experience, habit of response, intellectual grasp, and emotional engrossment. One's definition of the situation includes not only one's own values and motives but those motives imputed to others as well. One does not define the situation and then sequentially decide how to act. Yet, the potential for the introduction of spontaneity with the variety and interest it can add to the college classroom calls for a constant reassessment of the situation. Spontaneous decision-making of this nature seems to be more of a requirement in some instructional roles than in others. These processes are often tied up with a review and reinterpretation of preceding events and lines of action. To use the vernacular, a definition of the situation would be dictated by "where one is coming from." This study asks faculty where they have "come from"--i.e., their own prior teaching and undergraduate experience.

Origin of Faculty Role Perceptions

What are the origins of faculty role perceptions? Willard Waller offered this explanation in 1932:

> The role appears as the organization of the individual with reference to an entire situation; it is the response of the individual to the entire situation as it has taken shape in his mind. Some insight (correct or incorrect) into the attitudes of others is implied. The insight may be entirely fallacious, or it may be incomplete, but to play a role is to regulate one's behavior by the imagined judgments of others.[33]

He later talked about role fluidity, which he called the "kaleidoscopic shifting of roles,"[34] and suggested that the good teacher can masterfully flow from one role to another playing "supplementary or even contradictory roles"[35] in the life of a group. They are shaped by the culture and include the university subcultures, literature, tradition, custom, media, precedent, prior training, and--for both faculty and students--antecedent exposure to the teaching/learning process. Students know how to be college students from having been in earlier student roles. Students and teachers know how teachers should behave from having observed teachers in prior settings.

College teaching, unlike most professions, does not require that one undergo a specified teaching preparation other than a Ph.D. in one's subject matter and perhaps a teaching assistantship. In a recent dissertation on teaching improvement, Jael Noam wrote:

> Thus, the main emphasis in graduate work is the in-depth knowledge preparation, and only incidentally how to

---

[33]Willard Waller, Sociology of Teaching (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1932), p. 322.

[34]Ibid., p. 332.

[35]Ibid., p. 326.

> communicate to others this acquired knowledge. As Bleger and Cooper in The Preparation of Teachers point out, "The American college teacher is the only high-level professional man on the American scene who enters upon a career with neither the prerequisite trial of competence nor experience in the use of the tools of his profession."[36]

Notions of the instructional roles of a university faculty member remain peculiarly ambiguous, individualized, and in the beginning not grounded in experiences of practice or trial and error. Also, as noted earlier, the reward system at the university tends to demean the teaching function. If a university faculty member perceives teaching to be of little value in the university's reward system, his teaching behavior may reflect this. The complicated world in which a professor is immersed at the university will force far-reaching decisions about which instructional roles to play in the classroom.

We know that an individual's role and world view definition influences role behavior. The question that this poses is to what extent do all individuals in a particular role (in this instance, university teachers) define the world around them in similar terms. Therefore, antecedent factors that might account for faculty defining the situation differently will also be studied.

Specific questions about the size and type of

---

[36]Jael Noam, "Developing and Evaluation of a Model for Improving University Teaching" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1973).

institutions relating to a professor's own undergraduate education are included in the questionnaire to see if they correlate with one's perceptions of instructional roles.

Does the "cognitive structure"[37] of a discipline, the methodological approach used by scholars to acquire information in a discipline, affect instructional roles? And the related question of whether faculty members' role perceptions of classroom behavior are shaped by stereotypes of reference others from the same general branch of knowledge are addressed in the study. The questionnaire asks faculty members to identify the general branch of knowledge which they are teaching to determine if there is consensus on stereotypic roles within their academic discipline.

In summary, role, then, is a construct. Like the term "ego" in psychology, "self" in philosophy, or "soul" in theology, it serves as an organizing concept. It is a "process entity."[38] Ford and Urban warned us, however, that "concepts are abstractions: they represent particular classes of events. Concepts and their labels are shorthand, convenient methods for thinking about analyzing and generally dealing with many discrete occurrences and the generalities among

---

[37]R. Gagne, "Some Views of Learning and Instruction," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1970, p. 39.

[38]Raymond Rogers, Coming into Existence (Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1967), p. 128.

them."[39] Bearing in mind that the term "role" arises out of the "individual's cognitive/symbolic interpretation of his various interactions with others,"[40] the term will be used throughout to group and organize puzzling classroom phenomena.

Michael Polanyi made a good case for the value of organizing concepts such as role. He wrote:

> The damage done by specification of particulars may be irremedial. Meticulous detailing may obscure beyond recall. . . . Speaking more generally, the belief that, since particulars are more tangible, their knowledge offers a true conception of things is fundamentally mistaken. . . . The destructive analysis of a comprehensive entity can be counteracted in many cases by explicitly stating the relationship between its particulars.[41]

Perhaps, in addition to the classroom watcher's analytical tools of videotape, sociograms, and interaction graphs, the concept of instructional roles will become a useful tool with which to reintegrate the information learned from the other types of analysis.

The concept of role analysis has been used successfully in investigating several other professions. The investigation of college professors' roles has almost no empirical

---

[39] M. Ford and R. Urban, System of Psychotherapy (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963), p. 710.

[40] Glenn R. Erickson, "A Study of the Self-Esteem and Academic Self-Concepts of Ability- and Randomly-Grouped Ninth Graders" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1972), p. 27.

[41] Michael Polanyi, The Tacit Dimension (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1967), p. 19.

base. Its usefulness for investigating this population has yet to be demonstrated. The next section reviews two role analysis studies from two different professions as a justification and rationale for this study.

Role Analysis Applied to Other Professions

Empirical studies of professional roles are a fairly recent research phenomenon. It would seem that the social forces at work in the culture have exerted and will continue to exert pressure on all aspects of our national life--which, in turn, should make role studies more popular. And as one writer describing the process of cultural change has pointed out,

> . . . the unconscious factors for change cease to be merely psychological. They lie in the whole pattern of relations with other people and, more particularly, in the social institutions by which these relationships are governed: the rules of communication employed by the culture or group. These include the conventions of language and law, of ethics and aesthetics, of status, role and identity, and of cosmology, philosophy and religion. For this whole social complex is what provides the individual's conception of himself, his state of consciousness, his very feeling of existence.[42]

As institutions change to reflect new values generated by new information from the behavioral sciences which get disseminated in the culture, the roles which are inextricably bound up with those institutions are subject to change, also. Two institutions experiencing such change are the Roman

---

[42]Alan Watts, Psychotherapy East and West (New York: Ballantine Books, 1962), p. 20.

Catholic Church and the public schools. Role analysis studies from these institutions were examined to determine the generalizability of approach.

The Role of the School Superintendent

The first, and probably most famous role analysis, was that of Neal Gross, Ward Mason, and Alexander McEachern, a study of school superintendents in Massachusetts.[43] These researchers found that one must avoid approaching the study of role as if consensus existed on its definition. They also noted that role studies involved perceptions and, therefore, have a subjective and objective aspect. This meant, in the case of the school superintendent, that his role must not only be studied by self-report but also through the reflected appraisals of other populations with whom superintendents interact. The problem is compounded by the complexity and diversity of the publics to which he must be responsive; i.e., the school committee, his middle-management personnel (the school district's administrators--assistant superintendents, principals, vice principals, and curriculum specialists), the faculty, the taxpayers, and the students.

Degree of consensus of the school superintendent's role was found to vary. Lack of consensus comes from

---

[43] Neal Gross, Ward Mason, and Alexander McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958).

differential definitions of expectations associated with a role and the varied interaction frameworks of role incumbents.

The school superintendent study also emphasized the necessity for studying role segments in order that the degree of consensus on different segments can be ascertained. The decision to isolate the segment "instructional role" as a manageable research problem for investigation in this study was a direct result of the research on school superintendents. A second role analysis study--that of the contemporary priest--was also examined for further methodological information.

The Role of the Priest

The priest's role was the subject of a study in sociology in 1973 by Mary Ellen Reilly.[44] She found that the Roman Catholic priesthood of Western Massachusetts was experiencing role reorientation. Age proved to be the most significant variable in explaining the differences she found. Younger priests are attempting to expand the priest's role into new areas of involvement. Adapting their role as priests to the realities of contemporary life seemed to be a new direction for young clergy. Closer affiliation with the laity, less affinity to a hierarchical order, reassessment of

---

[44]Mary Ellen Reilly, "A Study of Self-Defined Clergy Roles among Roman Catholic Diocesan Priests" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1973).

traditional Catholic positions on abortion, divorce, political life, and celibacy were issues on which younger priests are experiencing role strain. Their predictions for their role in the future included "working priests," part-time priests, and optional celibacy.

These findings concurred with those reported by Gross et al. in their study of school superintendents. Both studies noted that consensus on role definition did not exist among their subjects. "Perhaps these findings imply that role is a dynamic concept that can be modified and adapted, yet it continues to retain its normative definition which is shared by society's members."[45] Questions of age and faculty rank were on this study questionnaire to determine the importance of age and rank in the emergence of new instructional roles, as suggested by Reilly's findings.

In conclusion, examination of these two role studies persuaded the researcher that role analysis could be both appropriate and productive for an investigation of university teaching.

Summary

What emerges, then, from this survey of the educational, historical, humanistic, and social psychological perspectives? They have been included because of a fundamental

---

[45] Ibid., p. 232.

premise that says if we want to understand anything, we at least have to know what it came out of and what it is connected to.

Many of the instructional roles currently encountered in college classrooms are derived from an historical perspective of faculty functions relevant for other times and places. Their appropriateness for today's universities is questionable.

In this chapter a perspective on humanistic psychology suggested that alternative instructional roles may be more responsive to the differing values of American youth. The case for newer roles was strengthened by the repercussions of the knowledge explosions as discussed in the educational perspective.

The process of how role perceptions are acquired was elaborated on in the social psychological perspective. Generalizing from role studies in two other professions, the justification of an analysis of the professorial role was constructed. Now let us sharpen the focus from background to foreground and look at the empirical research surrounding the professoriate.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH ON THE PROFESSOR

Investigations of university teaching have traditionally consisted of six major types:

1. Lists of personality characteristics of college teachers in general.[1]
2. Lists of personality characteristics of college teachers identified as being "good teachers" by some population (such as self-reports of faculty, faculty colleagues, administrators, students, alumni, and outside observers).[2]
3. Lists of methods used by college teachers, mostly derived from measures of learning outcomes.[3]

---

[1]E. Arden, "Faculty as Teachers," Educational Forum 32 (May 1968): 447-452; Eble, Professors as Teachers; R. Hofstader, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1963); Knapp, "Changing Functions of the Professor," pp. 299-303; D. G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960); D. Walhout, "Teacher Image in America," Journal of Higher Education 32 (January 1961): 31-35; and C. A. Weber, "Some Characteristics of College Teachers," Journal of Educational Research 46 (1953): 685-692.

[2]A. Combs, D. Avila, and W. Purkey, Helping Relationships (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971), pp. 1-17; Eble, Professors as Teachers; J. Gaff, "Making a Difference: The Impacts of Faculty," Journal of Higher Education 44 (1973): 605-622; and Knapp, "Changing Functions of the Professor," pp. 303-307.

[3]Axelrod, The University Teacher as Artist; W. J. McKeachie, Teaching Tips (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1969); B. Joyce and M. Weil, Models of Teaching (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972); and P. Runkel, R. Harrison, and M. Runkel, eds., The Changing College Classroom (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969).

4. Lists of objectives elucidated by college teachers.[4]

5. Lists of teaching behaviors performed by teachers identified as being "good teachers" by some population.[5]

6. Lists of roles which the college professor plays in the classroom (the focus of this study).[6]

---

[4]Ruth Beard, Objectives in Higher Education (London: The Society for Research in Higher Education, 1968), pp. 1-23; B. Bloom et al., eds., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: Longman, Green & Co., 1956); N. Gronlund, Stating Behavioral Objectives for Classroom Instruction (London: Collier-McMillan Ltd., 1970); and R. Mager, Preparing Behavioral Objectives (Palo Alto, Calif.: Trearson Publishers, 1962).

[5]R. Adams and B. Biddle, Realities of Teaching (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970); W. W. Charters, Jr., "The Social Background of Teaching," in Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), pp. 781-800; Ned Flanders, Analyzing Teaching Behavior (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970), pp. 1-53; B. Grant and D. Hennings, The Teacher Moves (New York: Columbia Teachers College Press, 1971); M. Hildebrand, R. Wilson, and E. Dienst, Evaluating University Teaching (Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971; A. Perlberg, "Microteaching: A New Process to Improve Teaching and Training," Journal of Educational Technology 1 (January 1970): 35-43; R. Miltz, "Microteaching--a Description," School of Education, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1973, pp. 1-9 (Xeroxed); B. Rosenshine, "Identifying Important College Teaching Skills," paper presented to the International Conference on Teaching Improvement, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, October 1974; R. Smock and F. Crooks, "A Plan for the Comprehensive Evaluation of College Teaching," Journal of Higher Education 44 (November 1973): 557-585; and J. McNeil and J. Popham, "The Assessment of Teacher Competence," in Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), pp. 218-225.

[6]N. L. Gage, Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Education: The Search for a Scientific Basis (Palo Alto, Calif.: Pacific Books, 1972); A. Graska, "Developing Alternative Teaching Methods through an Analysis of Instructional Goals," Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education, University of Cincinnati, February 1974, pp. 1-21 (Xeroxed); R. Mann et al., The College Classroom: Conflict, Change and

Fifty years of research into college classrooms has resulted in a shift from looking at the teacher to looking at teaching. The change in the suffix "-er" to "-ing" symbolized an important shift. Prior research into what a college teacher is has not proved to be productive. Mosher and Purpel remind us that "[after forty years of research] we do not know how to define, prepare for, or measure teacher competence."[7] The new research has turned to looking at what the college teacher does--a move to the process of education.

Shifting from analyzing teaching rather than the teacher focuses investigation on the transactional nature of the learning process. The use of videotape and the development of microteaching and behavioral objectives are an outgrowth of this new movement in instructional research. The research over the past fifty years has a definite direction and, with some exceptions, a definite chronology. Robert Knapp thoroughly reviewed studies of the college professor in 1962.[8] A condensation of his review follows in the next section.

Learning (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970); W. J. McKeachie, "Conflict and Style in the College Classroom--an Intimate Study," Psychology Today, February 1971, pp. 47-52; R. Schmuck and P. Schmuck, Group Processes in the Classroom (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1971); and W. Waller, The Sociology of Teaching.

[7]R. Mosher and D. Purpel, Supervision: The Reluctant Profession (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972), p. 36.

[8]Knapp, "Changing Functions of the College Professor," p. 299.

Characteristics of College Professors

Bowman surveyed "high quality periodicals from 1900-1938 and found the favorable characteristics of the stereotype of a college professor to be: idealism, love of knowledge, humanness, unselfishness, breadth, dispassion, practicality, competence and charm. Unfavorable characteristics included: dullness, social inadequacy, unmanliness, unwholesomeness, and impracticality." The moral tone of these lists seems quaint to today's reader.

Kelly listed the qualities he found in "great teachers of acknowledged distinction." His list included: sympathy, helpfulness, sincerity, enthusiasm, knowledge and mastery of subject, breadth, and industry.

In 1930 Clinton asked students to give their views on the ideal college teacher. It was reported by the students in the following order that he should: be interested in students, be fair, have a pleasing personality, have a sense of humor, have a mastery of the subject, possess a keen intellect, and have a wide range of information. Clinton concluded that "students, in the main, are less impressed by intellectual command or creativity than by qualities associated with personal amiability and social skill."

Ten years later Bousfield again asked students for their views of the ideal college teacher. This list was tabulated in the following order: fairness, mastery of subject, interesting delivery, organization of material, clear

exposition, and interest in and helpfulness to students.

Four hundred and nineteen liberal arts college presidents were polled by Trabnel in 1950. Their ideal teacher would give encouragement to individual thought, be emotionally stable, be friendly, be tolerant, and be sympathetic to the problems of college students.

Beardslee and O'Dowd, reporting in 1959 on a 95 percent return on a study of faculty self-image, listed these characteristics: caution, stability, calmness, absence of emotional problems, and adaptability.

Knapp's report of a study in progress in 1959 compared the students' image of the college professor to their image of members of other professions. The students reported that their image of a college professor was that he possess intelligence, thoughtfulness, personal satisfaction, wisdom, ability to play chess, interestingness, a happy home life, and colorfulness.

Negative qualities of the college professor were studied by Guthrie in 1954. This list of the three worst qualities read: lack of warmth, unfriendliness, and a tendency toward sarcasm.

Lazarfeld and Thielens in 1958 showed that professors tend to affiliate predominantly with the Democratic rather than the Republican Party.

Gustad showed in 1959 that college professors (in the Southern sample he used) tend to come disproportionately from

the homes of teachers and clergymen.

Maslow and Zimmerman in 1956 found that faculty rated "creativeness" higher in their colleagues than students did. The students in the study tended to value "a good personality."

Probably the most recent list of the attributes of the effective college teacher was set forth by Kenneth Eble. His visits to many college classrooms across the nation led him to identify these qualities: generosity, discipline, energy, variety, ease of examples and illustrations, enthusiasm, clarity and organization, honesty, and a sense of proportion.[9]

An interesting statistic about urban college professors was revealed in 1973. In a table compiled to show the "Percentages in Occupational Groups Who Would Choose Similar Work Again," urban university professors ranked first at 93 percent. Of a cross-section of white-collar workers (including professionals), only 43 percent would voluntarily choose the same work that they were doing again.[10]

Perhaps a recent published interview with Jerome Kagan best capsulized the research literature on the teacher: "The

---

[9]Eble, Professors as Teachers, p. 29.

[10]Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Work in America (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1973), p. 16.

best teacher is a good human being."[11]

Teaching Methods of Professors

Along with research on the characteristics of college teachers and the characteristics of "effective" college teachers, a third avenue of inquiry--that of looking at the efficacy of the methods used by college teachers--has also been researched. Predictably, as with the lists of characteristics, we are no closer to agreement that any single teaching method is best for learning in all situations.

> The research evidence dealing with this question is remarkably ambiguous. There have been several hundred studies comparing one general teaching method to another, and the overwhelming portion of these studies, whether curriculums are compared or specific methods for teaching specific subjects are contrasted, show few if any differences between approaches. Although the results are very difficult to interpret, the evidence to date gives no encouragement to those who would hope that a single reliable, multi-purpose teaching strategy has been identified.[12]

A brief review of studies of those methods most frequently used in university classrooms was made by McKeachie.[13] Almost half a century of research results indicated that a preferred method (lecturing vs. discussion) depended on one's goals in teaching. Effects shown on tests of factual

---

[11]P. Coons, "All People Rated Equally Intelligent," Boston Globe, 5 May 1974, p. 17.

[12]B. Joyce and M. Weil, Models of Teaching (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 4.

[13]McKeachie, Teaching Tips.

knowledge were not consistent; but in studies that have measured problem-solving ability, attitudes, or motivations, the results have favored the discussion method.

McKeachie also reviewed studies of the laboratory method and concluded that time spent in the laboratory could be reduced without educational loss. However, the results of research on methods of teaching in the laboratory indicated that the effectiveness of the laboratory depends on the manner in which the work is taught.

Actually, all of these studies of the laboratory method pointed to the importance of developing understanding rather than teaching solutions to problems by going through a routine series of steps.

And so, this third approach to college instruction, like other approaches, has proven to be inconclusive. Objective classroom watchers, still unable to embrace a dogma, turned their attention to yet another facet of the problem: teaching objectives.

University Goals and Teaching Objectives

Any study of classroom objectives must be put into the bigger picture of the goals of university education. Two descriptions of goals will be cited: the goals of any university and the goals of the University of Massachusetts/Amherst.

Robert Paul Wolff enumerated the goals of the modern-day university as follows: (1) a sanctuary for scholarship,

(2) a training camp for the professions, (3) a social service station, and (4) an assembly line for the establishment man.[14]

He pointed out how these diverse goals conflict and compete with each other and how that competition affects the instruction at a modern university. Wolff suggested that competing goals were the origin of student unrest in the sixties--specifically, at Columbia University where he was teaching during the student take-over.

Another source of institutional goals--these aims were those of the University of Massachusetts/Amherst, in particular--was The 1973 Report of the President of the Massachusetts university system. Robert Wood disclosed the "constant aims" of the University of Massachusetts. They were four: (1) a university of national ranking; (2) a university giving public service; (3) improving collaboration in higher education (private, local, regional, and national); and (4) improving the effectiveness of learning and teaching.[15]

The institutional labyrinth resulting from the complexity of the modern university's goals was discussed by Joseph Axelrod.[16] His chapters on the "University as a

---

[14]Robert Paul Wolff, The Ideal of the University (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969).

[15]Robert Wood, The Report of the President (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts, 1973), pp. 4-9.

[16]Joseph Axelrod, The University Professor as Artist (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973).

Supersystem" are very enlightening in providing the reader with a grasp of the magnitude of the problems which university education, in general, faces.

Axelrod dealt with a systems approach to understanding modern universities. He, a professor himself, believed that the typical university professor has little scientific knowledge about the workings of the university as an institution. Claiming that the interdependence and interrelationships of the university system often make any basic curricular or instructional reform impossible to effect, he denounced the old "architectonic" (building block) model. This traditional way of looking at a university as a brick wall where bricks can be interchanged and substituted for each other constrains our thinking too much, argued Axelrod. He postulated that the reason why institutional reforms fail is because, in reality, the university is a gigantic conglomerate of interrelated and independent systems--all set in motion at once.

Functional, rather than structural, was the model he presented.

Teaching Objectives

A handful of descriptions of general teaching objectives was in the literature on university education. They do not readily lend themselves to empirical study and so were merely lists of one person's thought about what that person

expected a university education to do. A summary--the following list--was drawn from a book by Ruth Beard.[17] According to this writer, the objectives of teaching were changing, but a good university teacher still should: (1) provide a sufficiently broad base of knowledge so that one can adjust to new subject matter or new subjects throughout life; (2) foster inventiveness; (3) give students different perspectives and show how to coordinate them; (4) cater to individual differences between students; (5) provide activities for students but leave room for some student initiative in acquiring necessary skills; (6) show students applications, consequences, and corollaries of knowledge; (7) break down the learning steps; (8) select materials; (9) show how to formulate and present a contrary view; (10) have students verbalize their criticism of a theory in order to make them aware of their assumptions and prejudices; (11) encourage student decision-making; (12) indoctrinate students into Western scientific thought; (13) practice by rote; (14) produce an individual who is an expert in various specialties who can maintain and develop the economy and can advance knowledge in an increasing number of fields; (15) encourage students to make objective judgments, to make assumptions and envision their consequences with an eye to "respect for

---

[17]Ruth Beard, ed., Objectives in Higher Education (London: Society for Research in Higher Education, 1968), pp. 1-23.

others"; (16) enable students to select appropriate principles and generate new ones; (17) enable students to select from a repertoire of principles in solving or discussing varieties of problems, rather than merely applying known principles, to problems of a stated kind; (18) enable the student to use some complex relationships such as proportionality, correlation, and probability when sifting data, planning experiments, or following events in history; (19) foster divergent thinking; and (20) help students master the environment and help students modify their environment to gain increasing control over it.

The college psychology teacher cited earlier, Wilbert McKeachie, made an extensive review of the higher education teaching literature in order to extract just what faculty described as being the intended teaching objectives used to reach their classroom aims.[18] As it turned out, the information he gleaned from this became the precursor to a new direction in his thought. The objectives reported (incidentally quite similar to those found by Ruth Beard and cited above) were later modified and condensed into a classification of university faculty roles by several of his colleagues. Many of these were used or modified for use as partial questionnaire items for this present study.

---

[18] W. McKeachie, "Procedures and Techniques of Teaching: A Survey of Experimental Studies," in The American College, ed. N. Sanford (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962), pp. 313-364.

Bloom's Taxonomy

A series of research findings from quite different areas in the past decade has brought an expanded notion of what a meaningful college education should be. Research in the behavioral sciences began to point to a multidimensional approach to human learning. This expansion of education was supported by Bloom and his colleagues as they posited three domains of learning: (1) the cognitive domain, (2) the affective domain, and (3) the psychomotor domain.

Other concurrent developments included: viewing the classroom as a social/emotional climate (which came out of the research on how groups function), "incidental learning" and nonverbal classroom communication. And finally, achievement prediction based on the expectations that teachers communicated to their students seemed to indicate that much more was occurring in the classroom than we had been led to believe.

It seemed only natural that a major inquiry into teaching objectives would appear. For this major development in approach to the instructional process, teachers are indebted to Benjamin Bloom. Bloom and his colleagues had been wrestling since 1948 with testing and evaluation issues. In 1956 they published the first of a trilogy Bloom was to undertake in the three domains of learning that he and his group had identified.[19]

[19]D. Krathwohl, B. Bloom, and B. B. Masia, Taxonomy

Suggesting that education of an individual requires more than low-level cognitive training was a major breakthrough in the thought about teaching and learning. His message has especially powerful implications for college-level instruction, which up to the present has too often emphasized the cognitive domain and low-level recall of factual information within this domain, especially in introductory courses.

Bloom's taxonomy revealed that there are levels of depth within each domain. The cognitive domain, for example, moves upward through six levels--from knowledge to comprehension to application to analysis to synthesis to evaluation.

Although Bloom's work has been mostly adapted to elementary and secondary education in the form of objectives (expressed in behavioral terms), it has a great potential for adaptation in university education, also.

His contribution cannot be underestimated in all levels of education. Attempts to bridge the gap in the last decade from objectives to teaching behaviors designed to reach those objectives has been a direct outgrowth of Bloom's work.

Any given course of study, such as introductory chemistry, would contain hundreds of specific objectives from all three domains. The magnitude of such a collection of objectives has made some faculty quite resistant to their use.

---

of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: Longman, Green & Co., 1956), p. 1.

Translating them into specific, isolatable teaching acts and ranking performance on these has been a further refinement in educational thought to which we now turn.

Specific Teaching Behaviors

Diagnosis of teaching behaviors has always been hampered by the simultaneous interaction of multiple factors. Attempts to isolate specific teaching behaviors is rather like pushing the stop-button on a movie projector in order to blow up a particular frame. Teaching behaviors organized into skills are identifiable, however, in the light of objectives.

Culled from other lists, the Clinic to Improve University Teaching at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst has evolved a rather thorough list of teaching behaviors which it has codified in a student questionnaire called TABS (Teaching Analysis By Students). Michael Melnik, the Clinic Director, began with a much larger list of seventy-eight items.[20] Honing the list down to its present thirty-eight teaching items was a matter of reassessment and refinement in light of new data which came back from its use in the past two years (see Appendix A). Although there have been over three thousand student questionnaires developed to help assess college instruction in the classroom,[21] some in use since 1908,

---

[20]"Skills to Improve University Teaching," paper prepared for the Clinic to Improve University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1972. (Xeroxed.)

[21]Smock and Crooks, "A Plan for the Comprehensive Evaluation of College Teaching," p. 577.

expressing teaching activities in behavioral terms is fairly recent. A copy of the TABS appears in Appendix A as representative of this approach.

A related development is the work of Paul Adams, also a staff member at the Clinic to Improve University Teaching, on "studenting skills"--an attempt to learn more about the teaching/learning transaction. A copy of the Studenting Skills Questionnaire is appended (Appendix B).

Instructional Roles in the Classroom

What a faculty member determines his/her instructional roles to be can help to make explicit a great deal of one's implicit teaching. If one can identify how one perceives his/her function in instruction, if one can satisfactorily answer the question, "Who focuses on what, how, and for what purpose?" then some precision and appropriateness in the selection of particular teaching/learning activities should follow.

> Generally speaking, the concept of role stresses the influence of contemporaneous forces arising in the person's immediate social environment to impress and guide his behavior. It designates, in particular, the force constituted by expectations of a person which are held by significant others in his milieu. The person lives in an environment in which other people around him expect him to be (and not to be) a certain kind of person or expect him to behave (and not behave) in certain ways, and these expectations vary systematically from one situation to another in which he and other people are enmeshed. In the sociologically oriented role

> theories, the expectations are regarded as culturally patterned and as attached to the statuses or positions a person occupies rather than immutable to the person himself. In any event, the force of expectations is transmitted to the person during interaction between himself and significant others. The force is effective, however, only as the person perceives, or cognizes, the expectations. Role theorists in education are inclined to the view that perceived expectations constitute the behaviorally influential environment of the person.[22]

Roles, in short, serve as the instructor's behavioral gyroscope.

A major attempt to particularize and categorize the instructional roles of a university faculty member has been the work of Richard Mann et al. in 1970.[23] Later, in 1971, Wilbert McKeachie carried the instructional role idea further. Based on the Mann study, he linked teaching roles with learning roles. An attempt was made to cluster students according to different roles. They were: compliant students, anxious-dependent students, discouraged workers, independent students, heroes, snipers, attention seekers, and silent students.[24]

He explained his approach this way:

> Formidable conflicts can arise in a teacher's mind even before he enters the classroom. He may hope to "get lots of material across" but also want to have the "students explore their own reactions, even if it takes time." Or he may feel that these performances make it hard for him to get to know the students. There is a difficult and complex process involved in deciding the

---

[22]Charters, "The Social Background of Teaching," p. 789.

[23]Mann et al., The College Classroom.

[24]McKeachie et al., "Conflict and Style in the College Classroom--an Intimate Study," p. 47.

> kind of teacher one will be--a process that includes regretfully giving up some roles and energetically avoiding others.[25]

This all implies that, if students' roles can be matched to the teacher's role to complement each other, a kind of reciprocal learning transfer can take place.

It should be pointed out that a thorough investigation into instructional roles requires "two sets of parallel data which are measured to determine how the roles are perceived as somehow alike or different."[26] The first step in any investigation of interaction, however, must necessarily consider the parties to a classroom interaction separately. And so this study is being undertaken to shed some light on the faculty's perceptions of its instructional roles only.

The Students

There is an obvious limitation attached to a study of perceptions which polls only one population of perceivers. The other population involved with faculty perceivers are the students. The present study, a beginning attempt to investigate role perceptions, must of necessity focus only on one set of perceivers. As a conclusion to this chapter, a descriptive word or two should be said about the recent University of Massachusetts/Amherst student beyond the

---

[25] Ibid., p. 45.

[26] Charters, "The Social Background of Teaching," p. 791.

acknowledgment in Chapter I of diverse learning styles.

Robert Wood, the University's president, in his 1974 commencement address, noted that nationally there had been a change in the 1974 students' reading tastes. "Primers on home-grown revolution, memoirs of the barricades such as: Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman, Raymond Mungo and Bobby Seale" used to top the list, noted Wood. Contrasting today's student mood, he cited the top four national student best-sellers:

> I'm O.K., You're O.K.; Jonathan Livingston Seagull; Carlos Castaneda's studies of a Yaqui Indian shaman's view of reality; and Erich von Daniken's speculations on the behavior of pigeons and men.
>
> The common thread in these vastly different books seems to be a search for a lost sense of relationships to others, to society, to the universal.[27]

In addition to Wood's assessment of the new student mood, several researchers categorized student subcultures at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst.

Student Role Orientations

Role data were compiled on freshmen by Stanfeld and Schumer in 1967[28] (Class of 1971). That study listed eight orientations students have toward their role in college.

---

[27]Robert Wood, "Commencement Address of the University of Massachusetts/Amherst," Amherst Record, 7 June 1974.

[28]R. Stanfield and H. Schumer, "Changing Role Concepts of College Students," report prepared for the Office of Education, Bureau of Research, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., August 1967.

Briefly, they were:

The Vocational orientation represents a concern for acquiring skills and knowledge that will be directly applicable to future employment or for successfully completing a course of study in college so that one will be qualified for certain jobs requiring a college degree.

. . . . . .

The Instrumental Collegiate orientation is a particular kind of orientation toward the collegiate culture. The preferences shown in this factor run toward active participation in extracurricular activities as a leader, an organizer, or a worker.

. . . . . .

The Intellectual orientation to the role of student is conceived as an interest in art and ideas outside the context of formal course instruction in a college.

. . . . . .

The Consummatory Collegiate orientation represents another orientation to the collegiate culture of a university campus. In this instance, the student seems to be a "consumer" of the collegiate environment produced by those with an Instrumental Collegiate orientation. The emphasis is on being rather than on doing.

. . . . . .

An orientation toward Social Development indicates a concern with developing the self through meeting people and helping people.

. . . . . .

A Ritualistic orientation is characteristic of students who are somewhat more strongly oriented toward their homes than they are to the college or university. At the campus, they seem to prefer activity or inactivity that is solitary rather than social--for example, "playing solitaire" or "working on crossword puzzles." Neither the academic nor the collegiate environments excite them. They dislike "participating in serious discussion in class" and "going to parties that are wild." Their orientations to the future are apparently bound up in their relationships with their parents. They seem to be passing through the educational experience without any clearly defined personal goals.

. . . . . .

The Academic orientation is one in which the student manifests an interest in knowledge acquired within the context of courses, examinations, and grades.

. . . . . .

The eighth orientation is specific to the Fraternity and Sorority system of the American college. Virtually all items on this factor make reference to the Greek life.

No clear relationships between pre-college environment and the fraternity-sorority orientation were established in this research.[29]

The student subcultures identified here point up the difficulty faculty members encounter if they adhere to a limited set of roles. Each student within a particular role classification approaches education in slightly different ways. This brief overview of the Shumer and Stanfield study gives us some idea of the complex classroom milieu in which professors must teach.

Summary

When one steps back from the university campus, it is possible to put the pressures for new modes of college teaching into a larger perspective. The relentless tendency toward a more fulfilling and egalitarian life-style has put the guardians of fixed roles on the defensive. This movement in educational institutions is paralleled by reforms in child-rearing, participatory democracy, family structure, community medicine, and religious institutions. As one historian of higher education pointed out, "The likelihood was remote that the American college would enjoy stability while everything else experienced growth, flux, and ferment."

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 1-4.

Throughout the nation young people, and significant numbers of older people, are challenging the limited roles assigned to them by traditional society. Traditional university teaching severely limits both the student and the teacher. In the new milieu at American universities, both appear to need more expansive roles. During the dynamic young-adult years, exposure to a greater diversity of teaching roles seems to be especially important.

Role analysis is a relatively new way to examine a person's place in society. G. H. Mead gave impetus to the concept of role in 1925 and its use has grown steadily ever since. There has been sufficient acceptance of role theory so that a body of data should be forthcoming on university teaching roles. Borrowing from Wilbert J. McKeachie, Richard Mann, and Joseph Axelrod's work and from the current literature, this writer has identified thirteen instructional roles available to the university faculty member. This study will attempt to add empirical evidence to the identification of instructional roles and thus add another perspective to the beginning body of data on role analysis of university teaching.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

This chapter focuses on the questionnaire and methodology employed in the present study to clarify some of the abstract concepts related to role theory, as it specifically relates to the teaching role of the professor.

Rationale for Questionnaire Study

If one is to study how a group of individuals such as a faculty perceive themselves in a role, it is important to keep the concept of "self" in mind.

> Self is a key concept in explaining the development of role behavior. Self is sometimes used to mean the organization of personality qualities or the experience of identity. However, it is more useful in role theory in the more limited usage of G. H. Mead, who by self means simply that a person is the object of his own activity; he can act towards himself as he acts towards others. . . . This usage implies that a person is both subject and object; he takes a position from outside and views his own thoughts, feelings and actions. . . .
>
> Only by seeing himself as an object can he know how to check, guide and judge his own behavior and act according to others' expectations.[1]

The self has unparalleled significance in the determination of the organization of the phenomenological field. The nature of the relationships of the self to other parts of the field--to other objects, to people, to groups, to social

---

[1]Frederick Elkin, The Child and Society (New York: Random House, 1960), p. 33.

organizations--is of critical importance in understanding the individual's perception of a connection between various objects, individuals, groups, and himself. Carl Rogers summed up the value of self-report data this way: "The person is the best source of information about himself."[2]

Undertaking a study of faculty perceptions of its instructional roles seemed to call for either individual interviews or a questionnaire.[3] The decision to construct and administer a questionnaire was made because of the very practical advantages it offered; namely, the widest coverage at a minimum expense of time and money. Unlike the interview, however, there was no way to detect the willingness of the sample population nor whether the questions had been misunderstood--both of which contribute to the problem of nonrespondents. "Language," wrote A. North Whitehead, "is always ambiguous as to exact proposition that it indicates."[4]

Phase 1: Item Selection

The methodology used in the study is described in six phases which occurred from Spring 1974 to Spring 1975.

---

[2]Carl Rogers, Theories of Personality, eds. C. Hall and G. Lindzey (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965), p. 479.

[3]T. Bingham and H. Moore, How to Interview (New York: Harper & Bros., 1941); and R. Kalm and C. Connell, The Dynamics of Interviewing.

[4]A. N. Whitehead, Process and Reality (New York: Macmillan, 1929), p. 113.

A search of the higher education literature on instruction was made, as described in Chapter III, to determine if consensus existed on the definition of faculty instructional roles. In addition, the writer and three faculty members "brainstormed" a list, gleaned from their own teaching experiences, of over two hundred possible labels for roles which could be played in the college classroom. Drawing heavily from R. Mann et al. and W. J. McKeachie, the roles were confirmed from teaching patterns detected by the investigator in the viewing of over fifty individual college classroom videotapes of faculty clients participating in a teaching improvement program. The researcher roughly factor-analyzed the brainstormed list of roles into a collapsed list of thirteen. The final list included these instructional roles: information processor, guide, example, credentialing agent, recruiter, catalyst, taskmaster, authority figure, screener, person, learner, resource, and facilitator. Short mottoes of explanation were written to accompany each role on the final list.[5] Three dimensions--Emphasis, Satisfaction, and Training--were selected for ranking on a 1 (high) to 5 (low) scale.[6] Several sources in the literature indicated

---

[5]R. Mann et al., The College Classroom; McKeachie, Conflict and Style in the College Classroom--an Intimate Study; and McKeachie, Teaching Tips.

[6]Axelrod, The University Teacher as Artist.

that certain status items might have more bearing than others in influencing a faculty member's perception of his/her instructional roles. Eleven seemingly relevant demographic or status items were selected for inclusion in the questionnaire. Three of these items were thought to be factors which influence all people in any role: age, sex, and rank (or title).

The notion of antecedent exposures to role as shapers of that role is well known in social psychology. It was determined to include items on the questionnaire which would seek to find out if this concept could be tested empirically in regard to professors. For this reason antecedent shapers which seemed to be particularly related to faculty were included. They were five: the subject taught, the type of institution where a faculty member received his/her undergraduate education, the length of service at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst, and the type and size of the university where a faculty member taught previously (if any).

The importance of teaching in relation to the other faculty functions--research and service, which are generally agreed upon in the higher education literature as categories for promotion and tenure decisions--were selected, also.

Phase 2: Questionnaire Construction

The ramifications of imposing rigid definitions on scientific thinking notwithstanding,[8] closed questions were decided upon over open questions because the provision of forced-choice alternatives allowed ease of computer tabulation.

Brevity was kept in mind at all times during the construction phase. The questionnaire was designed to minimize the time required of the respondents. The design also tried to make the fifty-item questionnaire less formidable by collapsing the thirteen roles and their three dimensions (the first thirty-nine questions) into a series of check-off boxes which gave the appearance of thirteen items in Section I. The directions for filling out the questionnaire gave an example of what each of the numbers (1 to 5) stood for in words. They appeared in a boxed-in portion of page one. The remaining eleven questionnaire items made up Section II. The entire questionnaire was six pages long.

From the standpoint of returns, the literature suggested that a printed or xeroxed questionnaire paid dividends over a mimeographed copy[9] so the questionnaire was xeroxed.

---

[8]D. B. Zilversmit, "Impact of Rigid Definitions on Scientific Thinking," Perspectives in Biology and Medicine 12

[9]G. Mouly, The Science of Educational Research (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1970), p. 259.

Enclosures

A cover letter, to be enclosed with the questionnaire, was composed by the researcher. It was typed on white stationery with a University of Massachusetts/Amherst letterhead and a School of Education subhead. A decision was made not to use the Clinic to Improve University Teaching letterhead in an effort to channel the responses as little as possible. In the letter the study was identified as a doctoral study, even though the writer had found statements in the literature noting that providing data for another's research was often a sore point with university faculty.[10] Directions for using the postage-free campus mail were in the letter, which was signed by the writer with her nickname and surname. It was hoped that a personalized, informal approach would seem less imposing and perhaps would enhance returns.

An envelope with the writer's return address handwritten on the front was provided, along with a postcard preaddressed to the writer which was to be filled out with the faculty member's name and campus address, should he/she be interested in obtaining a summary of results. Faculty members had been promised that their responses would be kept anonymous. A number-coding system was devised on the corners of the envelopes to duplicate a master list of numbers in order that the writer would not poll again those who had already responded.

---

[10]A. Perlberg, J. Peri, M. Weinreb, E. Nitzan, and J. Shimron, "Microteaching and Videotape Recordings: A New Approach to Improving Teaching," Journal of Medical Education 47 (January 1972): 43-50.

Phase 3: The Pilot Study

Twenty faculty members were randomly selected to respond to the pilot questionnaire. In addition, ten faculty clients known to the researcher from their participation in a teaching improvement program made a total of thirty faculty polled in the pilot study.

The pilot study served a variety of purposes, the first of which was to measure and improve the readability of the questionnaire. Second, improvement of the precision of the questionnaire language was sought. Third, information on ways to improve the clarity of the questionnaire's directions was solicited. A fourth purpose was to test the sampling process. A fifth purpose was to seek information on how to improve the handling, processing, and recording of the responses. The sixth purpose of the pilot study was to obtain information as to the appropriate strategy for accumulating and reporting the data. After explaining the purpose of the study in a general way, the pilot study cover letter added: "As you respond to the questions as they now appear on the questionnaire, would you be willing, in addition, to jot down on the margin any thoughts, comments, or suggestions as to how in your judgment the questionnaire could be improved?"

The pilot questionnaire was timed to be released on 30 March 1974. It was hoped to be a propitious time in terms

of faculty workload--just prior to wrapping up the 1973-74 year. Oddly enough, a concurrent development in the Massachusetts state legislature regarding state university faculty's teaching load focused attention statewide on the teaching role of Massachusetts public higher education faculty. Considerable acrimony and debate over a faculty member's teaching time began to rage in the Boston and county press. It culminated in a proposal to the preamble of the University's budget passed on 7 May 1974 by the Massachusetts state senate.[11] How this affected faculty responding to this questionnaire is not clear, but it is perhaps safe to assume that an issue as close to home as this one may have contributed to the attitude of faculty respondents in some way.

Nineteen faculty members responded to the pilot study. An analysis of the pre-test data indicated that certain roles and role mottoes were ambiguous. Changes in wording were offered by some of the respondents and were incorporated. One respondent made a suggestion that was followed in reordering the Section II items. The final draft, incorporating all the information from the pilot study, was completed in mid-March 1974 (see Appendix C).

---

[11]"Letter to the Faculty," Massachusetts Society of Professors/American Association of University Professors, May 1974, p. 1. (Offset.)

Phase 4: The Sample

The Population

The faculty members who have provided the data for this study were employed by the University of Massachusetts/Amherst. The most recent statistics then available on the University as of 1973-74 provided some idea of the size of the faculty body and how they were distributed (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

SELECTED STATISTICS ON THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS/AMHERST, 1973-74

Type	Number
Resident instruction	1,393
Emeriti	102
Part-time and demonstration	96
TOTAL	1,591

Source: Administrative Officers and Faculty, 1973.

The Sample

Five hundred faculty members on campus were asked to respond to a questionnaire entitled "A Study of Instructional Role Perceptions at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst." The first faculty name was selected by a random entry into

the University October 1973 Telephone Directory. Then every succeeding fourth-listed faculty member was chosen to receive a copy of the revised questionnaire. The selection process for respondents was continued on a serial basis until five hundred faculty members were identified.

Directions for filling out the questionnaire appeared on its first page. The questionnaires were hand-addressed and delivered to the campus mailroom on 30 April 1974 (see Appendix D).

A cover letter explaining the study, a return-addressed envelope, and a return-addressed postcard accompanied each questionnaire.

Phase 5: Follow-Up

As the returns came back to the writer's office, the numbers coded on the envelope corners were checked off on a master number list before being opened in order to preserve anonymity and to allow for follow-up to increase responses.

First Reminder

Two faculty members not in the study agreed to fill out the questionnaire while being timed. It was learned that the questionnaire took about ten minutes to fill out. On 13 May a short, typed, two-paragraph note was mailed out on a blue five-by-eight-inch sheet specifying the short amount of time one needed in which to respond. This served as an

informal reminder.

Second Reminder

On 20 May a final reminder letter with another copy of the questionnaire attached was mailed out on lavendar-colored paper, hand-written and xeroxed, to all those faculty members whose numbers had not been checked off the master list.

Phase 6: Analysis of the Data

Section I Data

The responses were transferred to Fortran sheets. The data cards were keypunched at the University Computer Center office and a verification of the cards was requested as a check on the accuracy of the data cards.

Consultation with a computer specialist resulted in special instructions designed for the computer on the SPSS[12] program. These instructions were developed in order to tabulate and present data in several forms: means, frequency counts, and percentages of the thirteen roles and their three dimensions from Section I (Items 1 to 13 converted into Items 1 to 39).

---

[12]N. Nie, D. Bent, C. Hadlai Hull, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970).

Section II Data

Items 14 to 24 (converted to Items 40 to 50) were to be computed as means, frequencies, and percentages.

Sections I and II Data

Cross-tabulations were computed for the thirteen roles and their dimensions from Section I against the demographic and teaching items of Section II. Thus, each item from 1 to 39 was cross-tabulated against each item from 40 to 50.

Data from the study would also be used for comparison with a summary of the national ACE-RANN study of faculty in 1973.[13]

The responses were then organized to provide baseline data for analysis and for future studies designed to reflect changes in role perceptions according to emphasis, satisfaction, and training. Also, future studies of role perceptions of the University of Massachusetts/Amherst faculty could be compared with the role perceptions of students from these tables.

---

[13] A. Bayer, "College Faculties: Le Plus Ca Change . . .," Change, March 1974, pp. 49-64.

C H A P T E R V

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

A role analysis study seeks to analyze how those who are actually performing a role perceive themselves in the role. This chapter attempts to describe those perceptions. All of the data are presented and analyzed; isolated findings of special interest are reported. Discussion highlighting certain findings follows in Chapter VI.

Respondents

A total of 271 questionnaires were returned (54.2 percent). Seventeen of these could not be processed, however, due to a variety of reasons. In five cases departmental secretaries returned the questionnaire by mail explaining that the faculty member had: died (1), was on sabbatical leave (3), or was "no longer here" (1). In twelve cases the faculty member returned the questionnaire explaining that it was not answered because of: a philosophical bias against all questionnaires (1); a dissatisfaction with the questionnaire itself (3); a dissatisfaction with the timing of its release (1); a dissatisfaction with the omission of "Dr." in the address on the envelope (1); a philosophical bias against attempts to quantify teaching (3); and the absence of undergraduate courses in his/her teaching load (3).

Eighty-two respondents (32 percent) returned the postcard requesting a summary of the results of the study, thereby identifying themselves.

Nonrespondents

A persistent problem in questionnaire studies is that of the nonrespondents. In this study they represented 45.8 percent of the total sample. As a research problem they are a concern because it is possible that they represent a population which is significantly different from the respondents.

C. A. Moser, in a thorough discussion of this research, provided several reasons why the problem occurs: "Where anything more than answering a few questions is required, the nonresponse is always higher. In mail surveys it is doubly hard to get a satisfactory response."[1] No attempt was made to contact the nonrespondents in order to determine if they were a significantly different population.

Data Reduction

This section is organized into three major parts. Part 1 includes treatment of the data from Section I of the questionnaire; i.e., the percentages of the thirteen roles by three dimensions. Section I data are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

---

[1] C. A. Moser, Survey Methods in Social Investigation (London: Heinemann, 1958), pp. 127-131.

Part 2 is comprised of a treatment of the background data derived from Section II of the questionnaire. They are presented in Tables 4 through 12.

Part 3 treats the data from the cross-tabulation of Sections I and II, presented in Tables 13 through 23.

Section I Data

The purpose of the study was to provide first-level baseline data about the role perceptions of the faculty at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst. Percentages of responses are reported in an effort to determine role patterns and trends. In addition, data which tended to support findings elsewhere in the higher education literature are reported. Only descriptive statistics such as means and frequency distributions are reported.

Because of the three dimensions which followed each instructional role on the questionnaire and the heterogeneity of responses to these dimensions, arranging tables in a rank order was not possible if all dimensions were to appear on a table. Therefore, on all of the tables constructed, the instructional roles and their dimensions appear in the same order as they did on the questionnaire itself.

Also, where feasible, the responses were collapsed into more distinct categories.

Section II Data

Tables of frequency distributions were compiled for each of the eleven items in Section II in order to generate a profile of those responding to the study.

Sections I and II Cross-Tabulated

Each role by its three dimensions had been cross-tabulated by the computer with each item in Section II and converted to percentages. A 1-to-5 scale with 1 the highest and 5 the lowest had been indicated on page 1 of the questionnaire with directions to circle one of the numbers. The data were separated into two categories--positive and negative--by the researcher. Responses 1 and 2, the highest on the scale, were combined for a "most positive response" total. Subtracting this total from 100 percent left a negative response which was a total of all the other responses (3, 4, and 5). Only "most positive response" percentages were included in the tables drawn up of the Section I and Section II data.

Part 1: Overall Findings

Which instructional roles were perceived by the respondents in this study as being meaningful to them? The mean for the population of faculty members studied for each instructional role on degree of emphasis given, amount of

satisfaction derived, and training received provided initial information on how the items were ranked by the faculty members. Each role was ranked 1 to 5, with 5 indicating the lowest level. Table 2 presents data based on how the professors ranked these dimensions in their role preferences.

Strongest Roles and Their Dimensions

According to means, the professors in the study perceived the following roles as receiving the most emphasis: (1) catalyst (1.716), (2) information processor (1.780), (3) guide (1.835), and (4) resource (1.911). They perceived themselves as deriving most satisfaction from the roles of: (1) catalyst (1.632), (2) guide (1.835), (3) resource (1.855), and (4) information processor (1.929). They perceived themselves as best trained for: (1) information processor (1.465), (2) catalyst (2.036), (3) credentialing agent (2.052), and (4) example (2.069). Notice that the means on the training dimension were higher on all of the roles as compared to emphasis and satisfaction, indicating a perceived lack of training for all the roles (see Table 2).

Weakest Roles and Their Dimensions

The highest means (indicating the least strength) of the thirteen roles on the emphasis dimension were: authority figure (3.672), which ranked thirteenth; screener (3.512), which ranked twelfth; and facilitator (3.308), which ranked

TABLE 2

MEANS AND RANKS FOR ROLES BY DIMENSIONS FOR FACULTY STUDIED

Role	Emphasis Mean	Emphasis Rank	Satisfaction Mean	Satisfaction Rank	Training Mean	Training Rank
Information Processor	1.780	(2)	1.929	(4)	1.465	(1)
Guide	1.835	(4)	1.835	(2)	2.162	(5)
Example	2.231	(6)	2.300	(7)	2.069	(4)
Credentialing Agent	2.494	(9)	2.548	(9)	2.052	(3)
Recruiter	2.280	(7)	2.035	(5)	2.211	(6)
Catalyst	1.716	(1)	1.632	(1)	2.036	(2)
Taskmaster	2.671	(10)	2.730	(10)	2.612	(8)
Authority Figure	3.672	(13)	3.563	(12)	3.322	(12)
Screener	3.512	(12)	3.944	(13)	2.983	(11)
Person	2.155	(5)	2.160	(6)	2.831	(10)
Learner	2.314	(8)	2.302	(8)	2.653	(9)
Resource	1.911	(3)	1.855	(3)	2.469	(7)
Facilitator	3.308	(11)	3.063	(11)	3.655	(13)

N = 254

eleventh. These roles ranked last on satisfaction and training, also. It is clear from the rankings on these instructional roles that, according to the self-perceptions of professors, they did not emphasize the roles of authority figure, screener, and facilitator; did not gain satisfaction from them; and felt that they were not well-trained for them (see Table 2).

Interrelationships of Three Dimensions

Interrelationships of the dimensions of emphasis, satisfaction, and training were apparent in the rankings. Three interesting discrepancies occurred, however. First, the role of credentialing agent, though not emphasized (9) nor found satisfying (9), ranked high (2) on the training dimension.

Second, the person role ranked fifth and sixth on the emphasis and satisfaction dimensions, respectively, but received a low rank of 10 on the training dimension.

Third, the role of resource came in high on the dimensions of emphasis (3) and satisfaction (3), but on the dimension of training it was ranked only at 10. Apparently, this study population did not perceive themselves as being well-trained for the roles of person and resource.

It should also be noted that the training dimension on certain roles was left blank by small percentages of respondents (see Table 3).

TABLE 3

RANK-ORDERED PERCENTAGES OF BLANKS ON TRAINING DIMENSION BY ROLE

Role	% Omitted
Authority figure	7
Facilitator	6
Learner	6
Guide	5
Person	5

Summary of Section I

None of the means for the thirteen instructional roles and their three dimensions exceeded 3.7. And so, although not all roles were equal in popularity, there was evidence that the faculty perceived them as recognizable instructional roles for their classrooms. Overall, the role of catalyst was perceived as being most emphasized and most satisfying. It was reported as second on the training dimension.

Close to it in emphasis (2) and training (1) but not satisfaction (4) was that of information processor.

Authority figure was perceived as least emphasized (13) and not very satisfying (12). Faculty also perceived themselves as poorly trained (12) for this role.

The dimension of training received higher means (indicating lower scores) on all thirteen roles.

Part 2: Profile of Respondents

The following figures provide a profile of the respondents.

Sex of Respondents

Those responding on the sex item were 219 males and 32 females, with three omissions. Table 4 lists the sex of respondents and the breakdown by sex of percent of questionnaires sent. The respondents were almost identical to the proportion of men and women in the sample (see Table 4).

TABLE 4

SEX OF RESPONDENTS

Sex	Number	Percent of Total Returned	Percent Sent
Males	219	86.2	87.8
Females	32	12.5	12.2
No answer	3	1.3	--
TOTAL	254	100.0	100.0

N = 254

Age of Respondents

The faculty members were asked to indicate their ages within five-year ranges. Table 5 gives the breakdowns reported by age.

TABLE 5

AGE OF RESPONDENTS

Age	Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Under 30	11	4.3	4.3
30-35	59	23.3	27.7
36-40	38	15.0	42.7
41-45	51	20.2	62.8
46-50	28	11.1	73.9
51-55	35	13.8	87.7
56-60	17	6.7	94.5
61-65	14	5.5	100.0
No answer	1	.4	100.0
TOTAL	254	100.0	100.0

Undergraduate Education

The largest category of the 254 faculty members responding were educated at state colleges or universities. Table 6 presents the undergraduate information.

TABLE 6

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS

Institution	Number	Percent
State universities and colleges	126	49.6
Private colleges and universities	102	40.2
Technological institutes	10	3.9
Other	16	6.3
TOTAL	254	100.0

Rank of Respondents

The responses to the item asking faculty members to check off their current academic rank revealed that the largest group of respondents was professors. Table 7 describes the academic rank of the respondents and gives a breakdown of questionnaires sent. These percentages agree quite clearly with the breakdown by rank in the sample.

Years Teaching at University of Massachusetts/Amherst of Respondents

Over 65 percent of the faculty reporting have been teaching on the campus less than ten years, the largest category of 35 percent having taught from "5 to less than 10 years." Table 8 gives the number and percent of number of years of teaching on the campus.

TABLE 7

ACADEMIC RANK OF RESPONDENTS

Rank	Number	Percent of Total Returned	Percent of Total Sent
Professor	94	37.0	35.0
Associate Professor	82	32.2	31.0
Assistant Professor	71	28.0	
Instructor	5	2.0	
Lecturer	2	0.8	34.0
No Answer	0	0.0	
TOTAL	254	100.0	100.0

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF YEARS RESPONDENTS HAVE BEEN TEACHING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS/AMHERST

Years Taught	Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 - less than 1 year	3	1.2	1.2
1 - less than 5 years	78	30.7	31.9
5 - less than 10 years	88	34.6	66.5
10 - less than 15 years	33	13.0	79.5
15 - less than 20 years	18	7.1	86.6
20 - less than 25 years	15	5.9	92.5
25 - less than 30 years	15	5.9	98.5
30 - less than 40 years	2	0.8	99.2
40 or more years	2	0.8	100.0
No answer	0	0.0	100.0
TOTAL	254	100.0	100.0

Type of Institution Where Previously Taught Reported by Respondents

Slightly less than half of the faculty members in the study have had prior teaching experience at other state universities (44 percent). The next most frequent category of response was "other," which turned out to include an assortment of teaching assignments from elementary schools to foreign universities. Noteworthy also is the number of missing responses on this item. Fifty faculty members did not respond to the item (see Table 9).

TABLE 9

TYPE OF INSTITUTION WHERE RESPONDENTS HAVE TAUGHT PREVIOUSLY

Institution	Number	Percent
State university	90	44.1
Small private liberal arts college	15	7.4
State college	11	5.4
Large private university	37	18.1
Technical institute	2	1.0
Other	49	24.0
No answer	50	19.7
TOTAL	254	100.0

Size of Institution Where Previously Taught

How large were the institutions where the faculty respondents taught previously? Twenty-six percent answered "under 5,000." Thirty percent did not reply. There was no response category for those who had never taught, and so it could be assumed that some of this 30 percent were new to teaching. This assumption seemed plausible because it correlated roughly with the number of faculty who did not answer similar questions about prior teaching. The other categories were fairly evenly distributed in their responses (see Table 10).

TABLE 10

APPROXIMATE ENROLLMENT AT INSTITUTIONS WHERE RESPONDENTS PREVIOUSLY TAUGHT

Enrollment	Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Under 5,000	46	26.1	26.1
5,000 to less than 10,000	25	14.2	40.3
10,000 to less than 15,000	28	15.9	56.2
15,000 to less than 20,000	25	14.2	70.5
20,000 to less than 25,000	18	10.2	80.7
25,000 to less than 30,000	16	9.1	89.8
30,000 or more	18	10.2	100.0
No answer	78	30.7	100.0
TOTAL	254	100.0	100.0

General Area of Knowledge of Respondents

What were the areas of knowledge in which the faculty members surveyed taught? The respondents answered fairly evenly with the exception of the "humanities," circled by only 18.6 percent. The category labeled "other" received sixty-four replies (25.3 percent). These were heavily distributed among the pre-professional programs at the University, such as engineering (14), business (13), and education (8), with a scattering of hand-written responses in public health, nursing, agronomy, fine arts, law, landscape architecture, nutrition, plant and soil science, and design (see Table 11).

TABLE 11

AREAS OF KNOWLEDGE OF RESPONDENTS

Areas of Knowledge	Number	Percent
Social and Behavioral Sciences	64	25.3
Humanities	47	18.6
Natural Science and Mathematics	78	30.8
Other	64	25.3
No Answer	1	0.4
TOTAL	254	100.0

Importance of Research, Teaching, and Service

The respondents on this campus attached great importance to the teaching role, as indicated by the fact that only 68 out of the 254 respondents did not respond in the highest category of "extremely important." Research was seen as "extremely important" by ninety-one respondents. Service was viewed as "extremely important" by only forty-one respondents (see Table 12).

TABLE 12

IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND SERVICE TO RESPONDENTS

Importance	Teaching		Research		Service	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Extremely important	186	73.2	91	36.1	41	16.1
Important	65	25.6	97	38.3	97	38.2
Somewhat important	2	0.8	47	18.2	85	33.5
Unimportant	0	0.0	16	6.2	28	11.0
Undecided	1	0.4	1	0.4	3	1.2
No answer	0	0.0	2	0.8	0	0.0
TOTAL	254	100.0	254	100.0	254	100.0

Comparisons with Professors Nationally

How typical of faculty members across the nation were those responding to this study at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst? In 1972-73 the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Research Applied to National Needs program (RANN) of the National Science Foundation surveyed 60,000 faculty members. Their initial findings were reported in the March 1974 issue of Change, from which the following comparison is drawn.[2]

Nationally, women comprise 16.5 percent of the faculty at universities as compared to 12.5 percent female respondents in the present study. Nationally, less than 8 percent were near retirement age (over 60 years old) versus 6 percent in this study. In the ACE survey, fully three-fourths (75 percent) of all faculty reported that they had been at their current institution for at least four years. Answering in the category of years of teaching on this campus, 67 percent of the respondents answered that they had been teaching here five years or more. The median age of faculty surveyed nationally was 40 years old. No such statistic was compiled for this study, but 57 percent of the respondents were 41 years old or older. The respondents in the study did appear to be typical of faculty members

---

[2]Alan Bayer, "College Faculties: "Le Plus Ca Change . . .," Change, March 1974, pp. 49-51.

TABLE 14

MOST POSITIVE RESPONSES ON PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES AND THEIR DIMENSIONS BY AGE
(PER CENT)

	EMPHASIS		SATISFACTION		TRAINING	
	Under 40	Over 40	Under 40	Over 40	Under 40	Over 40
INFORMATION PROCESSOR	83	74	73	76	91	91
GUIDE	73	74	69	77	58	66
EXAMPLE	53	66	44	66	59	73
CREDENTIAL-ING AGENT	52	56	45	55	39	70
CATALYST	81	81	86	75	65	61
TASKMASTER	49	48	44	48	69	49
AUTHORITY FIGURE	7	23	10	28	16	33
SCREENER	21	21	12	11	33	69
PERSON	63	69	62	65	34	45
LEARNER	56	59	53	59	47	47
RESOURCE	77	77	87	78	50	57
FACILITATOR	63	30	35	39	19	21

UNDER 40	108
OVER 40	146
N =	254

TABLE 13

MOST POSITIVE RESPONSES ON PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES AND THEIR DIMENSIONS BY SEX
(PER CENT)

	EMPHASIS		SATISFACTION		TRAINING	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
INFORMATION PROCESSOR	80.8	68.8	73.5	65.7	80.4	93.8
GUIDE	75.1	87.1	74.6	87.1	63.3	80.7
EXAMPLE	55	59.4	59.9	53.2	69.7	71.9
CREDENTIAL-ING AGENT	66.5	54.8	52.3	54.8	71.6	64.5
RECRUITER	56.2	75	68.5	75	58.8	80
CATALYST	82.4	83.8	87	87.1	68.4	80.6
TASKMASTER	50	50	47.8	46.9	49.1	53.2
AUTHORITY FIGURE	17.4	15.6	21.4	18.8	28.7	22.6
SCREENER	19.6	31.2	10.2	12.5	35.6	38.7
PERSON	63.9	84.4	60.5	87.4	37	61.3
LEARNER	56	68.8	56	56.3	44.4	58.1
RESOURCE	76.1	84.4	77	84.4	52.1	64.5
FACILITATOR	25.6	63.3	34.3	53.3	17.5	36.6
NO RESPONSE	3					
WOMEN	32					
MEN	219					
N =	254					

higher on the people-centered roles of person, learner, and especially facilitator across all three dimensions, except for satisfaction with the learner role. The role of guide was higher across three dimensions, also (see Table 13).

Age and Instructional Role Perception

Age is another standard discriminator in role studies. Age is known to affect a person's self-perception. Did age discriminate on any of the roles in this study? Collapsing the data roughly in half into "over 40" and "under 40," the study showed differences in the dimension of training on five roles: example, credentialing agent, authority figure, screener, and person. On each of these roles the "over 40" group felt they were well-trained. The authority figure and example roles on all dimensions found higher percentages for this age group, also.

As for the "under 40" group, the role of facilitator was emphasized much more; the role of catalyst was found more satisfying; and the role of taskmaster received a higher training percentage (see Table 14).

Academic Rank and Instructional Role Perception

Senior faculty of full-professor rank have the most prestige in the departmental hierarchy of a university. Did senior faculty perceive their instructional roles differently

respect to the eleven items on Section II? Much of the cross-tabulation data of Sections I and II seemed to show little difference. Isolated findings often were only partially consistent at best or inconsistent at worst with trends which had been predicted in the literature. Therefore, caution must be used in attaching too much importance to the findings which follow. They have been presented mainly because they point up some discrepancies which may be worth further study. A difference of ten percentage points (twenty-five responses) was used as the discrepancy in determining what seemed to be important to report.

Sex, Age, and Rank

Sex and Instructional Role Perception

Did female professors differ from male professors in how they perceived themselves in their instructional roles? Because only thirty-two women responded, anything under 80 percent of these thirty-two would be fewer than twenty-five people. However, since the percentage of females teaching on the campus (about 16 percent)[3] corresponded somewhat with the percentage of female respondents (13 percent), they have been included.

Notice that the female respondents were generally

---

[3]"Distribution of Personnel by Race and Sex," summary paper for Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1972-73 and 1974-75. (Xeroxed.)

nationally in those characteristics noted above. In short, they were older males who had been teaching on this campus five years or more but were not near retirement.

To summarize, certain general findings about the University of Massachusetts/Amherst faculty members who responded to the study emerged from Section II of the questionnaire.

The respondents were: overwhelmingly males, 57 percent over 40 years old, almost evenly distributed according to their own private and public undergraduate educations, quite evenly distributed according to rank, and 65 percent having taught on campus less than ten years. They were also quite evenly distributed according to "approximate enrollment at institution where previously taught," except for the 26 percent from small colleges and 30 percent who did not answer (many of whom perhaps had never taught before); quite evenly distributed by area of knowledge with the exception of fewer respondents from the humanities; and overwhelmingly had taught in state universities prior to coming on campus. As for teaching, research, and service, teaching was the clear favorite in importance.

Part 3: Sections I and II Findings Cross-Tabulated

What were the findings of a cross-tabulation of the thirteen roles and their three dimensions on Section I with

from their juniors? The response categories of assistant professor, instructor, and lecturer were collapsed into one. The responses were roughly of even distribution.

Eighty-six percent of those at the professor rank emphasized the taskmaster role compared to 55 and 53 percent for their juniors. Satisfaction with the role of example was high at 71 percent for the professors, as opposed to 51 and 52 percent, respectively. Training for credentialing agent and catalyst was also higher.

As for junior faculty (assistant professors, instructors, and lecturers), three of the four roles described in this study as emerging new roles for faculty showed interesting differences. The role which received the highest percentages on all three dimensions when compared to faculty colleagues was that of person. The learner role was highest on emphasis and training. The role of facilitator was highest on emphasis and satisfaction but showed less than a ten-point difference on training. Junior faculty also reported themselves as better trained for the resource role.

Associate professors generally showed little difference with these exceptions: highest satisfaction on credentialing agent and resource; highest emphasis on credentialing agent; and poorest training on recruiter (see Table 15).

TABLE 15

MOST POSITIVE RESPONSES ON PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES AND THEIR DIMENSIONS BY ACADEMIC RANK
(PER CENT)

	EMPHASIS			SATISFACTION			TRAINING		
	Professor	Associate Professor	Lecturer Instructor Asst. Prof.	Professor	Associate Professor	Lecturer Instructor Asst. Prof.	Professor	Associate Professor	Lecturer Instructor Asst. Prof.
INFORMATION PROCESSOR	80	78	80	73	72	72	94	89	90
GUIDE	74	76	81	75	72	83	67	59	72
EXAMPLE	68	63	53	71	51	52	79	63	65
CREDENTIALING AGENT	49	63	56	50	61	47	75	61	65
RECRUITER	56	63	57	73	70	66	67	53	65
CATALYST	83	84	79	89	88	83	80	60	69
TASKMASTER	86	55	53	45	54	44	45	53	51
AUTHORITY FIGURE	21	15	14	27	13	22	32	24	27
SCREENER	20	16	29	12	9	13	37	34	40
PERSON	59	66	77	57	62	72	38	32	53
LEARNER	52	58	64	57	54	59	44	41	57
RESOURCE	73	79	81	74	81	52	43	50	62
FACILITATOR	20	27	43	32	36	46	19	20	23

PROFESSORS	94
ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS	82
ASSISTANT PROFESSORS, LECTURERS AND INSTRUCTORS	78
N =	254

Antecedent Shapers

Undergraduate Education and Instructional Role Perception

Ninety-seven percent of the graduates of public universities emphasized the role of taskmaster. Only 53 percent of the private college graduates emphasized this role (see Table 16).

Type of Institution Where Previously Taught and Instructional Role Perception

Because of the disproportionate number of respondents reporting as having taught in a public institution (101 out of 204), no comparisons were possible. Fifty fewer faculty responded to this item, also. (See Table 17.)

Size of Institution Where Previously Taught and Instructional Role Perception

Eighty-eight people did not respond to this item. The data were reduced to three categories: "under 10,000," "10,000 to 20,000," and "over 20,000." There was little difference in the findings. (See Table 18.)

Number of Years of Teaching on Campus and Instructional Role Perception

How did length of service on campus affect one's role perceptions? The literature has suggested that each institution has its own norms which affect one's perceptions.

TABLE 16

MOST POSITIVE RESPONSES ON PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES AND THEIR DIMENSIONS BY "TYPE OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTION" (PER CENT)

	EMPHASIS		SATISFACTION		TRAINING	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
INFORMATION PROCESSOR	85	71	73	68	80	90
GUIDE	71	81	73	78	66	64
EXAMPLE	68	57	65	51	73	64
CREDENTIAL-ING AGENT	58	47	53	48	72	67
RECRUITER	63	58	75	63	66	61
CATALYST	82	87	88	89	67	78
TASKMASTER	97	53	50	47	44	51
AUTHORITY FIGURE	21	16	22	23	31	28
SCREENER	23	24	10	14	38	34
PERSON	63	34	58	72	38	44
LEARNER	55	63	53	62	50	47
RESOURCE	77	79	74	84	56	55
FACILITATOR	25	39	33	44	20	33

TECHNICAL AND OTHER	26
PUBLIC	126
PRIVATE	102
N =	254

TABLE 17

MOST POSITIVE RESPONSES ON PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES AND THEIR DIMENSIONS BY "TYPE OF INSTITUTION WHERE TAUGHT PREVIOUSLY" (PER CENT)

	EMPHASIS			SATISFACTION			TRAINING		
	Public	Private	Other	Public	Private	Other	Public	Private	Other
INFORMATION PROCESSOR	76	75	82	66	73	78	82	90	78
GUIDE	66	83	79	66	79	77	55	73	64
EXAMPLE	58	61	59	61	55	57	74	76	59
CREDENTIALING AGENT	61	48	48	57	48	44	70	76	72
RECRUITER	66	58	45	74	67	62	68	63	60
CATALYST	87	85	80	90	88	88	73	77	69
TASKMASTER	50	44	50	46	38	52	50	50	57
AUTHORITY FIGURE	20	15	21	21	25	23	24	35	36
SCREENER	21	23	24	12	12	10	38	38	33
PERSON	72	62	65	71	62	53	47	46	38
LEARNER	61	57	60	60	45	65	43	50	60
RESOURCE	80	78	76	80	78	80	52	62	64
FACILITATOR	32	31	23	39	39	33	23	20	13
PUBLIC	101								
PRIVATE	52								
OTHER	51								
N =	204								

TABLE 18

MOST POSITIVE RESPONSES ON PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES AND THEIR DIMENSIONS BY "SIZE OF INSTITUTION WHERE TAUGHT PREVIOUSLY"
(PER CENT)

	EMPHASIS			SATISFACTION			TRAINING		
	Under 10,000	10,000- 20,000	Over 20,000	Under 10,000	10,000- 20,000	Over 20,000	Under 10,000	10,000- 20,000	Over 20,000
INFORMATION PROCESSOR	77	89	55	75	81	43	92	89	88
GUIDE	81	73	80	81	71	70	69	63	82
EXAMPLE	58	67	76	58	71	60	77	76	85
CREDENTIALING AGENT	57	62	64	52	60	64	81	71	71
RECRUITER	59	64	76	70	75	83	67	64	80
CATALYST	85	87	81	93	83	88	76	74	85
TASKMASTER	41	60	55	43	52	48	57	57	63
AUTHORITY FIGURE	16	30	10	14	32	23	32	37	21
SCREENER	17	19	33	10	9	17	33	38	54
PERSON	69	66	90	67	68	81	52	46	48
LEARNER	55	59	83	70	57	79	46	43	59
RESOURCE	86	70	83	86	75	76	69	49	63
FACILITATOR	31	37	37	35	42	50	21	22	24
UNDER 10,000	71								
10,000 - 20,000	53								
OVER 20,000	42								
N =	166								

By reducing the data to the three categories--"less than 5" (81), "5 to less than 10" (88), and "10 or more years" (75)--some differences did emerge. Faculty respondents who have been teaching on campus "10 or more years" (a group typified by job security) reported greater satisfaction derived from seven of the thirteen roles. They also reported themselves better trained than their colleagues on six of the thirteen roles. (See Table 19.)

Branch of Knowledge Taught and Instructional Role Perception

These respondents were fairly evenly distributed (with somewhat less in the humanities). Some tentative comparisons were possible. As a group the humanities respondents noted perceptions of greater emphasis and training on the learner role (74 percent and 63 percent, respectively) than their colleagues in other disciplines. Information processor was emphasized much more by faculty teaching in natural science and mathematics.

In addition, two roles were reported more frequently in the perceptions of faculty teaching in the professional schools. All three dimensions of emphasis, satisfaction, and training were reported for the roles of credentialing agent and authority figure. This finding reflects the sense of a different educational purpose so often expressed by those who teach in the professional schools. (See Table 20.)

TABLE 19

MOST POSITIVE RESPONSES ON PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES AND THEIR DIMENSIONS BY "NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING ON CAMPUS" (PER CENT)

	EMPHASIS			SATISFACTION			TRAINING		
	Less than 5	5- Less than 10	10 or More yrs.	Less than 5	5- Less than 10	10 or More yrs.	Less than 5	5- Less than 10	10 or More yrs.
INFORMATION PROCESSOR	79	90	91	73	75	79	89	92	91
GUIDE	75	75	92	74	74	93	63	68	76
EXAMPLE	64	61	69	57	55	73	71	68	79
CREDENTIALING AGENT	57	54	63	50	49	66	66	70	85
RECRUITER	59	57	55	67	61	79	67	62	66
CATALYST	85	85	73	89	87	76	69	74	77
TASKMASTER	44	55	57	41	52	55	40	54	60
AUTHORITY FIGURE	13	21	20	14	24	27	18	29	42
SCREENER	21	19	28	9	13	13	28	38	50
PERSON	65	74	69	56	73	69	35	47	45
LEARNER	62	57	63	56	53	68	45	82	67
RESOURCE	79	82	70	79	82	52	50	54	67
FACILITATOR	40	29	28	40	39	71	20	26	18
LESS THAN 5 YEARS	81								
5 - LESS THAN 10 YEARS	88								
10 OR MORE YEARS	75								
N =	244								

TABLE 20

MOST POSITIVE RESPONSES ON PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES AND THEIR DIMENSIONS BY "BRANCH OF KNOWLEDGE TAUGHT"
(PER CENT)

	EMPHASIS				SATISFACTION				TRAINING			
	Social & Behavioral Sciences	Humanities	Natural Science & Mathematics	Other	Social & Behavioral Sciences	Humanities	Natural Science & Mathematics	Other	Social & Behavioral Sciences	Humanities	Natural Science & Mathematics	Other
INFORMATION PROCESSOR	64	74	95	64	73	68	78	66	91	96	92	86
GUIDE	77	82	69	83	75	77	76	78	66	70	60	69
EXAMPLE	68	64	61	56	60	55	64	54	75	74	66	83
CREDENTIALING AGENT	43	48	57	70	45	55	47	64	63	70	66	81
RECRUITER	61	68	54	56	72	74	72	63	57	74	56	63
CATALYST	87	91	78	78	89	98	83	83	68	89	64	68
TASKMASTER	56	50	48	45	48	52	42	50	42	67	39	56
AUTHORITY FIGURE	16	13	13	27	19	15	18	32	21	36	18	42
SCREENER	16	32	22	20	3	22	9	14	28	49	37	37
PERSON	69	72	59	69	65	74	59	61	39	48	32	47
LEARNER	49	74	43	56	49	64	51	66	40	63	36	56
RESOURCE	77	85	73	77	76	83	63	80	49	62	53	56
FACILITATOR	27	36	19	44	25	47	30	49	15	24	13	32
SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES	64											
HUMANITIES	47											
NATURAL SCIENCE & MATHEMATICS	78											
OTHER	64											
N =	253											

Extreme Importance of Research, Teaching, and Service, and Instructional Role Perception

What was learned about those who ranked research, teaching, and service as "extremely important" in their total role as university faculty members?

Research. Those professors who viewed research as "extremely important" ranked these roles highest on emphasis: information processor (91 percent), catalyst (89 percent), guide (80 percent), and example (75 percent). They found these roles most satisfying: catalyst (90 percent), information processor (81 percent), recruiter (79 percent), and guide (76 percent). They reported themselves as best trained for: information processor (99 percent), example (80 percent), catalyst (79 percent), and recruiter (77 percent).

Teaching. Those who viewed teaching as "extremely important" preferred the roles of catalyst (83 percent), information processor (81 percent), guide (81 percent), resource (78 percent), and person (70 percent). They found these roles most satisfying (70 percent or more): catalyst guide, resource, information processor, and recruiter. They felt well-trained (70 percent or more) for only the roles of information processor, catalyst, and example.

Service. The few discrepant findings from the group who viewed their service role as "extremely important" were greater emphasis, satisfaction,and training for the

credentialing agent's role. They also saw themselves emphasizing the resource role (93 percent), finding satisfaction in it (93 percent), and feeling better trained for it (71 percent) than their colleagues (see Table 21).

To reiterate, sex, age, rank, branch of knowledge taught, and length of time taught at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst all appeared to affect the perceptions of the instructional roles of the faculty studied. Younger faculty, female faculty, humanities faculty, and faculty having taught on campus for less than ten years tended to view the "new" or emerging roles more favorably than did their colleagues.

On the whole, the faculty studied tended to emphasize their teaching role. The antecedent shapers of prior institutional settings showed no difference except for public institution graduates emphasizing the taskmaster role.

Summary of Findings

The purpose of the study was to analyze the perceptions of faculty actually performing the professorial role. By asking professors how they perceived themselves on a variety of possible instructional classroom roles, it was hoped that new baseline information would be obtained. From the preceding analysis of faculty perceptions, the following list of findings has been selected as being of particular interest.

TABLE 21

MOST POSITIVE RESPONSES ON PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES AND THEIR DIMENSIONS BY EXTREME IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND SERVICE (PER CENT)

	EMPHASIS			SATISFACTION			TRAINING		
	Extremely Important (Teaching)	Extremely Important (Research)	Extremely Important (Service)	Extremely Important (Teaching)	Extremely Important (Research)	Extremely Important (Service)	Extremely Important (Teaching)	Extremely Important (Research)	Extremely Important (Service)
INFORMATION PROCESSOR	81	91	83	74	81	78	92	99	93
GUIDE	81	80	74	81	76	79	69	71	72
EXAMPLE	64	75	71	61	67	71	70	80	80
CREDENTIALING AGENT	54	63	71	53	59	68	68	73	83
RECRUITER	59	70	61	72	79	80	64	77	74
CATALYST	83	89	90	89	90	90	72	79	79
TASKMASTER	52	49	63	51	45	61	53	49	61
AUTHORITY FIGURE	20	15	28	25	16	33	29	21	42
SCREENER	23	19	27	12	13	15	37	38	41
PERSON	70	65	76	66	62	73	44	38	53
LEARNER	61	62	60	60	59	60	48	50	45
RESOURCE	78	74	93	80	74	93	59	56	71
FACILITATOR	34	35	39	43	37	43	22	27	32
N =	254								

General Role Findings

1. Catalyst was the most emphasized role.
2. Authority figure was the least emphasized role.
3. Catalyst was the most satisfying role.
4. Screener was the least satisfying role.
5. Information processor was the role for which the respondents felt most highly trained.
6. Facilitator was the role for which faculty felt least trained.
7. Faculty found the teaching function extremely important.
8. When viewed as a cluster of roles, faculty felt least trained for the "newer" roles.

Specific Group Findings

1. Female faculty tended to see their roles differently from male, senior faculty, and older faculty.
2. Faculty over 40 years old felt best trained for the roles of example, credentialing agent, authority figure, and screener.
3. Faculty of senior rank emphasized the role of taskmaster.
4. Faculty of senior rank derived more satisfaction from the role of example than did the other faculty groups.
5. Faculty of junior rank reported the role of person highest on all three dimensions in comparison to their colleagues. In addition, the learner role was highest on

emphasis and training for these faculty.

6. Faculty whose undergraduate educations were at public institutions emphasized the taskmaster role.
7. Faculty who have taught on campus for ten years or more derived greater satisfaction than their colleagues from five of the eight traditional roles and two of the five newer roles.
8. Faculty who have taught on campus for ten years or more felt better trained for six of the thirteen roles than did their colleagues.
9. Faculty who have taught on campus ten years or more gave the role of catalyst least emphasis and found least satisfaction from it as compared to their colleagues. In addition, though roles were fairly evenly distributed as to satisfaction among these faculty groups, the faculty who had been teaching longest were the most satisfied.
10. Humanities faculty ranked the roles of learner higher on dimensions of emphasis and training than did their colleagues from other disciplines.
11. Natural science and mathematics faculty emphasized the role of information processor much more than their colleagues from other disciplines.
12. Professional school faculty ranked the roles of credentialing agent and authority figure higher on all three dimensions than did their university colleagues.

Support for both the old content/teacher-centered roles and the new student-centered roles emerged from the study. Younger faculty, along with women, and faculty teaching at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst for less than ten years represented subgroups which indicated more familiarity with the newer roles.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

Certain college teaching roles have been traditionally described as teacher-centered and fall into a rough grouping related to content goals in the cognitive domain. These are: information processor, guide, example, catalyst, taskmaster, screener, recruiter, and credentialing agent. The last three are a subgroup related to the credentialing expectation of the wider world for the university.[1] The transmission of the culture to the young also has been a traditional expectation for the university.

Recent investigations regarding "hidden curriculum" in the classroom[2] have given the role of teacher as authority figure new prominence. The teaching roles of person, learner, resource, and facilitator are people-related roles.[3]

---

[1]Wolff, The Ideal of the University; and Rudolph, The American College and University.

[2]H. Gadlin, "Managing the Large Class: That's Entertainment," Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, Fall 1974 (xeroxed); J. Henry, Culture Against Man (New York: Random House, 1963); and J. Spring, Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972).

[3]Axelrod, The University Teacher as Artist; Brown, Human Teaching for Human Learning; Coles, Process Education; Flournoy et al., The New Teachers; Gaff, "Making a Difference: Impact of Faculty"; Postman and Weingartner, Teaching as a Subversive Activity; Rothwell, The Importance of Teaching; Runkel, Harrison, and Runkel, The Changing College

Such roles go beyond content goals into the affective domain seeking the fuller development of students. They serve to diminish the teacher's preeminence in the classroom and to focus more on the classroom interaction. The latter roles heavily emphasize the process of education and inductive thinking.

Strongest Roles

The professors in this study ranked the following instructional roles as receiving the most emphasis: catalyst, information processor, guide, and resource. With the exception of the instructional role of resource, the most emphasized roles were the content-related and teacher-centered ones. The faculty studied indicated that they derived most satisfaction from the roles of: catalyst, resource, guide, information processor, and recruiter, ranked in that order. They felt themselves best trained for these ranked instructional roles: (1) information processor, (2) credentialing agent, (3) catalyst, (4) example, and (5) guide.

A bedrock assumption which appeared again and again in the literature on improving college teaching was that, because college teachers have undergone no preparation for

---

Classroom; Schmuck and Schmuck, Group Processes in the Classroom; and Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom.

teaching, per se, they "do the same things that were done when they were taught."[4] This study confirmed the fact that most faculty members generally continue to perceive themselves in traditional teaching roles, with the usual heavy focus on content.

Further evidence lends even more credibility to the above discussion. On the training dimension, faculty in general reported perceiving themselves as well-trained information processors. As Ph.D. candidates with no formal preparation for a life in the classroom, this finding could have been predicted.

Within the faculty respondents there seemed to be subgroups emerging with a slightly different focus. They have not abandoned the strongest roles, but their responses to the questionnaire suggest that they are seeking to adapt and expand their repertoire of roles and the skills which accompany the roles. We might expect that subgroups within a faculty who have been undergraduates fairly recently or subgroups with a different world-view orientation, such as females, would be apt to take on newer roles. Regarding females, the literature on the psychology of women[5] plus a

---

[4]President Stephen Horn, "Horn-Munsee Interview," Newsletter on Teaching and Learning, California State University at Long Beach, vol. 1, no. 1, September 1974, p. 3.

[5]Judith Bardwick, The Psychology of Women (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), p. 162; and J. Gaff, "Making a Difference: Impact of Faculty."

recent study of the impact of faculty showed that women approach relationships in a highly people-centered way. This expectation was supported by the present study.

In addition, subgroups of lower rank and newer faculty (teaching on campus less than ten years) seemed to be convinced of a multidimensional role approach to instruction.

Faculty members educated in another era by mentors educated even earlier perhaps hold a different image of what a professor does in the classroom. Proceeding on different perceptions of what is called for in the classroom, they have based their behavior on assumptions about knowledge, the learner, and learning which have been only recently called into question. The expectations of a new student clientele for sensitive contact and relevancy, often inconsistent with the time-honored teaching model, can hardly expect to be met by a professor who finds these expectations inconsistent with his/her assumptions.

Weakest Roles

The finding of authority figure ranking lowest of the thirteen roles on all dimensions was interesting. Critics of contemporary educational institutions have suggested the power of incidental classroom learning in the transmission of cultural values.[6] One writer has even cited cultural

---

[6]Henry, Culture Against Man; Spring, Education and

value transmission as a university goal by calling the university an "assembly line for establishment man."[7] A University of Massachusetts/Amherst psychology professor has written:

> I would like to suggest that, in addition to whatever content students may learn in [large undergraduate] classes, they also learn about their own position in the social hierarchy. Specifically, through participating in hierarchically structured classes, they learn that they for the most part will remain people who are not very important in that social hierarchy. For most of our students college becomes one of many institutions in which they find themselves not important enough to have direct contact with the person(s) in charge. (In this case, it is the professor with whom they will not have much, if any, face to face contact.)[8]

Of course, it may be that the faculty members polled found the authority figure role ambiguous--it was defined on the questionnaire differently from its stereotypic usage. But one could also speculate that many faculty members, educated at another time themselves when the authority hierarchy was unquestioned, are unaware of what the pyramidal structure of university classes says to their learners. If Gadlin is correct, professors in this study were for the most part unaware of their own part in the subtle transmission of the value systems of the adult world; or perhaps on certain questions respondents felt that some responses were

---

the Rise of the Corporate State.

[7]Wolff, The Ideal of the University.

[8]Gadlin, "Managing the Large Class: That's Entertainment," p. 4.

more "correct" than others.

The strong emphasis on the role of taskmaster given by faculty who are graduates of public institutions seemed worthy of comment. The taskmaster role is related to motivation. Whose job is it to motivate students--that of the professor or the students themselves? Probably both. Perhaps there was something about faculty experience as undergraduates in public institutions which caused certain professors to rate this role perception so highly (97 percent).

The opposite role, if you will, to that of information processor is that of facilitator. Faculty in general perceived themselves as being least trained for this role.

The strong perception of satisfaction derived from playing multiple roles noted by faculty who have taught on campus for over ten years was a finding of note. Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment[9] has described such a group as the most resistant to change. It may be, however, that only those who truly enjoy teaching have elected or been allowed to remain at the University. Information about the nonrespondents would have been helpful here.

Another isolated finding of interest indicates that the older and senior faculty perceived the role of example as especially satisfying. This role is related to the

---

[9]Group for Human Development in Higher Education, Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change, 1974).

character-building function described in Chapter II which Knapp[10] has suggested was especially important in the early history of the professoriate in this country. Either these faculty members are part of a cultural lag, or they, as older professors, find genuine satisfaction and a clear identification in their role as examples.

A relationship between roles and objectives was demonstrated by the finding of professional school faculties. They reported high percentages on all three dimensions of the roles of credentialing agent and authority figure. Such a finding was anticipated from the literature.

A similar relationship between roles and objectives could be offered to explain the high ratings on emphasis and training for the learner role reported by the humanities faculty along with the high emphasis for the information processor role reported by natural science and mathematics faculty is noteworthy. Faculty playing the learner role in class model an inductive mode of inquiry which may be particularly conducive to the objectives of instruction in the humanities. The objectives of natural science and mathematics professors may be best served by playing the information processor.

The blanks left on the training dimension for the roles of authority figure, facilitator, learner, guide, and person indicate some confusion in the minds of the respondents. Perhaps the faculty who left this blank were unaware

---

[10]Knapp, "Changing Functions of the Professor."

that these particular roles are amenable to training.

Finally, the high mean of the training dimension for all roles corroborates the arguments in the literature for faculty development programs.

Overview

All thirteen roles appear to be perceived as tenable. Although there were important differences in percentages of response on some, no role was ignored. This suggests that Willard Waller was right in 1932 when he described the performance of the teaching role as a shifting kaleidoscope.[11] The professorial classroom role, then, is a dynamic concept responsive to a normative definition given to it by students, faculty, administrators, and society.

A word should be said about perceptions of the interrelationships of the three dimensions--emphasis, satisfaction, and training--with respect to each role. Findings on the dimensions were mixed. Perhaps where faculty emphasize a particular role, it is usually satisfying and they are well-trained for it. Whether a role is chosen because of training and is, therefore, performed well, which causes satisfaction and emphasis, is a matter for speculation. These dimensions did seem to be related in places but the data were inconsistent. Therefore, cause and effect

---

[11] Waller, Sociology of Teaching.

relationships were inconclusive.

In conclusion, the strong popularity of the teaching role on the campus deserves comment. The faculty development literature has constantly mentioned that, along with lack of formal preparation, the low priority given to teaching in the faculty reward system was the reason for poor teaching. Since the teaching function is not rewarded, so the argument goes, it is not carefully attended to by faculty. The study findings to the contrary could mean several things:

1. The responses were biased in favor of those interested in teaching, evidenced by their willingness to respond to a questionnaire about teaching.
2. The University's political climate at the time of the questionnaire distribution made faculty apprehensive. The questionnaire followed on the heels of several in-house attempts to ascertain faculty teaching loads and contact hours. Perhaps faculty responded dishonestly, not knowing how the results might be used, though anonymity had been guaranteed.
3. The faculty truly is interested in its teaching role, as evidenced by one-third asking for a summary of the study.
4. Self-report data yield information biased toward "acceptable" responses.
5. The winds of change are blowing.

Summary

From the faculty's own perceptions, it can be said that new roles are emerging among groups within the faculty body. Old roles are not dropping away, however. There seems to be an attempt to adapt, expand, and blend the new with the old. The professor's teaching role is fluid and malleable. It is shaped by those status items which shape all role perceptions--age, sex, and rank. Although other shapers are probably important, too, they could not be specified unequivocally in this study.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Faculty development centers have sprung up over the past few years in over one hundred institutions of higher education[1] to fill the gap which is almost universally recognized in teacher preparation for college professors. There is as yet so little certain evidence available to us about teaching that to wait for evidence would require us to cease most training activity for a generation or more. Workers in faculty development can only accept the stance that there are many hypothetical bases for action. The concept of instructional roles is one of these. Vigorous experimentation and lively debate about roles appear very much in order now and in the future. In the meantime, the use of the conceptual framework of instructional roles as a focus of faculty training looks promising.

The major purposes of this study were: (1) to investigate empirically faculty perceptions of their instructional roles and (2) to identify the role perceptions of specific subgroupings of that faculty.

Specifically, the study was an attempt to analyze

---

[1] J. Gaff, "A List of Instructional Improvement Centers and Programs," The Center for Professional Development, California State University and Colleges, Berkeley, California, 1975. (Xeroxed.)

the professorial role in instruction utilizing a questionnaire designed to assess emphasis given, satisfaction derived, and training received regarding thirteen instructional roles reported by faculty. From the findings generated come the sections which follow.

The present chapter is in three parts: the summary, policy decisions emanating from the study, and recommendations for future research.

Summary

Importance of Teaching

The study presents evidence that professors see teaching as extremely important. The finding that among professorial duties faculty ranked teaching before research in importance was unanticipated from prior research. A concurrent finding was a 1975 study of 1,069 faculty respondents from six colleges by R. Wilson, J. Gaff, E. Dienst, L. Wood, and J. Bavry. These researchers found that 88 percent of the respondents to their study listed teaching as their major source of satisfaction at the university.[2] Post-secondary higher education literature, especially in reference to the college and university reward system, has cited over and over again the preeminence of research as a reason for

---

[2] R. Wilson, J. Gaff, L. Wood, and J. Bavry, College Professors and Their Impact on Students (New York: Wiley Interscience, 1975).

ineffective teaching. We may be witnessing a realignment of priorities in higher education.

Response to Social Forces

Learners with new values have entered higher education because of a changing economy and the nation's commitment to mass education. New teaching tasks have appeared in response to the changing educational assumptions which grow out of the ramifications of a concomitant knowledge explosion and knowledge obsolescence. Both the new learners and the new tasks are interacting to raise student expectations regarding the college experience.

New instructional roles are developing in response to these societal forces. Younger faculty, faculty who have taught for less than ten years, junior rank faculty, and female faculty are the groups who identified themselves as being most familiar with emerging roles. Their different perceptions can be ascertained from demographic data.

Multiplicity of Roles

Older teacher-centered roles remain tenable, but there appears to be an effort on the part of some faculty to employ more diversified instructional roles. There is no one instructional classroom role. All faculty appear to employ a multidimensional role approach, with some seeking a much wider variety than others. Faculty perceived all

thirteen roles as descriptive of the various instructional functions they perform.

To recapitulate, the study's goal to determine whether the self-perceptions of faculty could identify the degree of emphasis, satisfaction, and training on thirteen instructional roles was met. The second intent, which was to ascertain whether certain subgroupings of faculty perceived their instructional roles differently, was achieved, also.

The results indicate the extreme importance of teaching to the faculty at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst. Second, faculty play multiple roles in instruction, mostly of a teacher- and content-centered nature. Third, subgroups consisting of female faculty, junior rank faculty, and faculty who have taught on campus less than ten years took instructional roles in their classrooms which could be described as emerging roles more frequently. Such roles are viewed in the higher education literature as a better attempt to respond to the new learners and new tasks in contemporary colleges and universities.

Policy Considerations

Based on the results derived from the questionnaire data, the following recommendations are made as a way to proceed in improving the quality of teaching at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst.

Development of Materials

Change is only possible when there are materials that enable faculty development workers to transmit abstract conceptualizations. Currently, there are no materials written or visual, which analyze teaching by classroom roles.

It is recommended that written materials be created. The process of creating, evaluating, and rewriting materials itself can take role theory as applied to professors beyond the exploratory step of this study.

Additionally, "showing, rather than telling" faculty about role-taking can be done by the development of videotape cassettes for training in awareness of role patterns. Vignettes of performances of the different instructional roles can be provided. One such tape should be of multiple examples of different faculty playing the same role. Another tape could be developed to show the same faculty member playing multiple roles during the same class time. A third tape could be made of different faculty members playing different roles in order to show faculty variations in subject matter, sex, and age. Audio tapes can be made, also. The voice alone often conveys instructional roles. Training packages can be developed and classified according to the skills needed for each instructional role.

Exercises to raise the awareness of students as to their part in reciprocal classroom role-taking can be

included in these packets along with model videotapes and other written materials.

Finally, a library of audio-taped cassettes of interviews with faculty interviewed by center personnel and identified by students and/or Teaching Improvement Specialists as being especially effective in taking certain roles, or many roles, can be collected to elucidate the thinking behind role decisions.

Therefore, it is recommended that procedures be initiated for the development of written, visual, and audio materials locally by assigning the task to a faculty development worker. Dissemination of role materials to other university faculty development centers is recommended, too.

Individualized In-Service Training for Teaching Improvement

A study by Centra[3] showed that the most change in teaching behavior occurs when the discrepancy between faculty self-perceptions and student perceptions of that faculty member are large. Faculty members may be unaware of the messages which their patterned role behavior is transmitting to students. Teaching Improvement Specialists can be trained in the analysis and interpretation of such patterns. Bringing the Gestalt of classroom patterns into the awareness of a

---

[3]John Centra, "The Student as Godfather? The Impact of Student Ratings on Academia," Educational Researcher 2 (October 1973): 4-8.

professor with the use of videotape can often provide the large discrepancy in perception needed to motivate change.

Faculty members participating in the individualized training program of the Clinic to Improve University Teaching can profit from filling out the role analysis questionnaire. The Teaching Improvement Specialist, through analysis of this role self-assessment, the student data from the TABS, and the videotape collected, can bring out possible faculty misperceptions regarding role enactment. Improvement strategies can then be designed to enhance those skills needed to play more roles and different roles which seem to be more appropriate for an individual's teaching style and for student learning styles as detected from the TABS data.

The concept of instructional roles can be used to help faculty identify the student groups calling for different instructional role treatment within a class. In this way instruction can become somewhat more personal and individualized.

It is expected that the written and taped training materials mentioned earlier can present information in the improvement strategy phase of the Clinic process.

The training packages classified according to role can be left on reserve at the faculty development center. Those faculty interested in training themselves can check these out for experimentation in the classroom.

The library of audio tapes suggested for development

can also be kept on loan at the center for check-out by those faculty interested in self-growth.

Therefore, it is recommended that the instructional role training materials indicated above be incorporated into the Clinic process, and that training packets classified by role as well as audio-taped interviews be made available to individual faculty who seek information but are not part of the Clinic's improvement program.

Group In-Service Training for Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching

The questionnaire results dramatically demonstrate the different perceptions of different faculty groups. An on-going process can be set up whereby these various groups can interact, share perceptions, and work toward role expansion.

In-service programs can enhance faculty awareness of instructional roles, develop and diffuse materials, and create a process for the continuous interaction of faculty from all disciplines. It is recommended that workshops be designed using a number of training techniques about role theory.

First, the questionnaire itself can be used to bring focus to the workshop. Or the roles on the questionnaire can be generated inductively from the workshop participants. Written materials can then be distributed which can be read

and reacted to in small groups. Simulated role playing by workshop participants can highlight the personal clues which people give off when playing certain roles. Micro-teaching sessions can be included to allow participants to experiment with the skills needed for new roles or to work on the skills for more effective performance of comfortable and familiar roles. Such training should draw upon role sources within the individual him/herself.

Using the role questionnaire in the design of an evaluation workshop can direct the attention of professors of small classes to their effectiveness in meeting the expectations of different students by performing various roles.

Workshops can be designed to show faculty how the skills they have mastered from the other faculty functions of research and service are transferable to their teaching. The research skills of inquiry and the scientific method, especially, are generalizable to the classroom.

Outside of the instructional framework is the role of faculty as advisor. Offering sound counsel regarding curriculum, vocational information, and departmental prerequisites is frequently mentioned in the higher education literature as needed by students. Workshops designed to train faculty on essential advising/counseling skills can be an important addition to faculty instructional role training.

Workshops designed especially for teaching assistants

can be viewed as an attempt at the pre-service teacher training which currently does not exist for would-be professors.

Therefore, it is recommended that group in-service training with instructional roles as a theme be offered by the faculty development center to mixed groups of faculty, teaching assistants, and departments.

Role Identification as an Aid to Students

In the selection of courses, students are more often than not in the dark about the kind of role behavior to expect from the professor teaching the course. Having a course description guide which includes an identification of the dominant roles which each faculty member plays in class can better enable students to match his/her own learning style with a professor's instructional roles.

Also, videotaped vignettes of a faculty member teaching can give much information to students in course selection. They can provide an advanced view of the different role behaviors of professors in classes in which a student may be considering enrolling. If used in conjunction with the Clinic's Studenting Questionnaire, the above role identification strategies can be even more useful.

Therefore, it is recommended that the feasibility of including role identifications in a course description guide for students be considered. And related to this, consideration of the feasibility of video vignettes of classroom

behavior be given as an aid in course selection.

Dissemination of Role Information to Departments

Considering the diversity of students and the multiplicity of instructional roles needed to handle this diversity, departments may want to consider differentiating their staffs along appropriate role lines. For example, the unassuming and shy faculty member should not be expected to play the role of catalyst in a crowded lecture hall of two hundred students.

Team teaching might be explored by more departments as a way to tap faculty role diversity within a department in order to handle student diversity. If one compares the optimism of the faculty in the study's findings with the often-cited disenchantment of students regarding university teaching, it would seem that faculty are often out of touch with their own teaching effectiveness. Perhaps departments can consider implementing some kind of feedback system--observations by departmental or interdepartmental peers on a released time basis, or Five College inter-university peer observers, or videotape playback, or student questionnaire data as feedback mechanisms to alleviate this problem.

Promotion and tenure decisions could include a statement by the faculty member of his/her intended instructional roles in order that his/her teaching not be judged by

incorrect or inappropriate role criteria.

It is recognized, however, that because of time constraints, most department heads do not feel they can give up the time to come to the center for help with such problems. An effort must be made to reach them in their own settings.

Therefore, it is recommended that audio-visual presentation of the above ideas be developed at the center which can be taken into departmental offices by the Teaching Improvement Specialists. This presentation can provide an opportunity for further discussion of the information presented and other departmental teaching improvement issues between the department head and a Teaching Improvement Specialist.

Recommendations for Future Research

The study has answered some questions, but has raised others. Role analysis does seem to be a useful organizing concept for studies on university teaching. The following further studies are recommended:

1. The relationship between a narrow view of instructional roles and a lack of teaching effectiveness has recently been suggested: "Effective faculty members do not perfunctorily enact their roles as undergraduate teachers. They more often go beyond their prescribed tasks of transmitting knowledge and skills than do their

colleagues."[4] Perhaps one key to effective teaching is taking a wide repertoire of instructional roles. The spontaneous shifting among roles may be an important correlate of effective teaching.

Therefore, it is recommended that the relationship between multiple role-taking and teaching effectiveness be examined.

2. What are the experiences which professors have in common across departments during their first five years of college teaching which make for the role breakdown by age found in the study? The factors by which professors become gradually institutionalized over time have not been studied empirically.

Therefore, it is recommended that investigations be made of the factors which influence role-taking in the first five years of college teaching in order to plan training programs for different age groups.

3. We do not know the precise types of influence exerted by prior variables in a faculty member's life. But the study found that status variables influence perceptions. Investigation of other variables could be useful. Perhaps type of graduate education can tell more about role origins than type of undergraduate education. Knowledge of antecedent variables and their influences may tell us something about the kinds of life experiences and people

---

[4]Wilson et al., College Faculties and Their Impact on Students, p. 192.

who choose to become professors.

Therefore, it is recommended that the backgrounds of college professors be examined to determine the factors contributing to the intrinsic motivation of professors in order to develop alternative faculty rewards.

4. Certain changes in behavior, attitude, and outlook result from self-knowledge. When are professors most likely to change instructional roles? Such information can be very useful in planning and predicting improvement work for target populations.

Therefore, it is recommended that the developmental evolution of self-knowledge of faculty over time be studied.

5. Branches of knowledge often call up certain stereotypes. The "mad" scientist, the "romantic" poet are images in the culture which are related to certain disciplines. Also, professors often cite the constraints of the discipline as reasons for narrow role-taking. The relationship of roles to the objectives of different branches of knowledge was found to hold in several findings in this study. Do some disciplines prohibit the taking of some roles? Research on this question can be of great value to those working in faculty development in terms of evaluating the feasibility of success for different types of improvement decisions.

Therefore, it is recommended that the relationship

of the objectives of different disciplines be studied for comparison with various roles.

6. Students frequently profess disenchantment with professors who take limited roles in the classroom. When faced with the opportunity to elect alternative methods which call for professors taking other roles, however, only small numbers of students elect to do so. The study points up the need for research investigating those students who take an active stance toward their own learning and make course decisions different from their peers as an aid to departmental course planning.

Therefore, it is recommended that the new students on American campuses, their needs, expectations, and course selection processes be researched.

7. A thorough role study should involve both subjective and objective aspects. The reflected appraisals of other populations which are part of the classroom interaction needs to be investigated, also.

Therefore, it is recommended that students at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst be surveyed as to their perceptions of instructional roles as performed in their classes.

8. The normative aspect of role-taking in the classroom explains whether students will be active or passive, competitive or collaborative, revealing or guarded. The role reciprocity which evolves in the classroom with its

predictable behaviors on both sides can help in the diagnosis of classroom learning environments. Certainly, a strong case can be made for a professor's recognizing the destructive potential of misperceiving the expectations of students. Role studies hold promise for investigating all parties to the cybernetics of the college classroom.

Therefore, it is recommended that further investigations be made of group dynamics in the college classroom to provide information for improvement workers about optimum intervention points.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

TEACHING ANALYSIS BY STUDENTS

(TABS)

TEACHING ANALYSIS BY STUDENTS

(TABS)

The Clinic to Improve University Teaching is working with instructors to improve the quality of teaching which they offer to their students. The Clinic is designed to help instructors identify and effectively use their particular teaching strengths, to isolate their specific teaching problems, and to develop improvement strategies directed at these problems.

In order to identify these strengths and problems, we are collecting information about teaching in this course by discussing course objectives and teaching patterns with your instructor, by observing and video-taping some classes, and by asking for student opinions about performance on some specific teaching skills and behaviors. The information will be used to obtain a clearer understanding of specific teaching strengths and weaknesses so that your instructor can work toward improvement. Thus, your responses will be of most value to your instructor if they are thoughtful and honest. Your cooperation will be very much appreciated.

Clinic to Improve University Teaching
School of Education
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Section I--Teaching Skills and Behaviors

In this questionnaire there are some statements concerning a variety of specific teaching skills and behaviors. Please read each statement carefully and then indicate the extent to which you feel your instructor needs improvement. Respond to each statement by selecting one of the following:

1. No improvement is needed
   (very good or excellent performance)

2. Little improvement is needed
   (generally good performance)

3. Improvement is needed
   (generally mediocre performance)

4. Considerable improvement is needed
   (generally poor performance)

5. Not a necessary skill or behavior for this course

Please make your decisions about the degree of improvement needed on the basis of what you think would be best for this particular course and your learning style. Try to consider each statement separately, rather than let your overall feelings about the instructor determine all the responses.

1. The instructor's explanation of course objectives
2. The instructor's explanation of the objectives for each class session and learning activity
3. The instructor's ability to arouse my interest when introducing an instructional activity
4. The instructor's explanation of the work expected from each student
5. The instructor's ability to maintain a clear relationship between the course content and the course objectives
6. The instructor's skill in clarifying the relationships among the various topics treated in the course
7. The instructor's skill in making clear the distinction between major and minor topics
8. The instructor's skill in adjusting the rate at which new ideas are covered so that the material can be followed and understood
9. The instructor's ability to clarify material which needs elaboration
10. The instructor's speaking skills
11. The instructor's ability to ask easily understood questions
12. The instructor's ability to ask thought-provoking questions
13. The instructor's ability to answer questions clearly and concisely
14. The instructor's overall effectiveness as a discussion leader
15. The instructor's ability to get students to participate in class discussions
16. The instructor's skill in facilitating discussions among students as opposed to discussions only between the instructor and students
17. The instructor's ability to wrap things up before moving on to a new topic
18. The instructor's ability to tie things together at the end of a class
19. The instructor's explanation of precisely how my performance is to be evaluated
20. The instructor's ability to design evaluation procedures which are consistent with course objectives
21. The instructor's performance in periodically informing me of my progress
22. The instructor's selection of materials and activities which are thought-provoking

23. The instructor's ability to select materials and activities which are not too difficult
24. The instructor's provision of variety in materials and activities
25. The instructor's ability to use a variety of teaching techniques
26. The instructor's demonstration of creativity in teaching methods
27. The instructor's management of day-to-day administrative details
28. The instructor's flexibility in offering options for individual students
29. The instructor's ability to take appropriate action when students appear to be bored
30. The instructor's availability for personal consultation
31. The instructor's ability to relate to people in ways which promote mutual respect
32. The instructor's maintenance of an atmosphere which actively encourages learning
33. The instructor's ability to inspire excitement or interest in the content of the course
34. The instructor's ability to relate the subject matter to other academic disciplines and real world situations
35. The instructor's willingness to explore a variety of points of view
36. The instructor's ability to get students to challenge points of view raised in the course
37. The instructor's performance in helping me to explore the relationship between my personal values and the course content
38. The instructor's performance in making me aware of value issues within the subject matter

Section II--Other Information

Please mark the appropriate response for each of the following items beside the correct statement number on the answer sheet.

39. Class:
    (1) freshman
    (2) sophomore
    (3) junior
    (4) senior
    (5) graduate student

40. Sex:
    (1) male
    (2) female

41. Grade point average:
(1) less than 1.50 (lowest)
(2) 1.50-2.49
(3) 2.50-2.99
(4) 3.00-3.49
(5) 3.50-4.00 (highest)

42. In terms of the directions my life is taking, this course is:
(1) relevant
(2) somewhat relevant
(3) irrelevant
(4) I am unsure

43. In this course I am learning:
(1) a great deal
(2) a fair amount
(3) very little
(4) I am unsure

44. As a result of this course, my attitude toward the instructor is:
(1) becoming more positive
(2) becoming more negative
(3) unchanged

45. As a consequence of participating in this course, my attitude toward the subject matter is:
(1) becoming more positive
(2) becoming more negative
(3) unchanged

46. I would prefer that this course:
(1) become more structured or organized
(2) become less structured or organized
(3) maintain about the present level of structure

47. Which of the following descriptions of student learning styles most nearly approximates your own? (Choose only one.)
(1) I like to think for myself, work alone, and focus on learning personally relevant content.
(2) I prefer highly structured courses and will focus on learning what is required.
(3) I try to get the "most out of classes," and like sharing my ideas with others and getting involved in class activities.
(4) I am competitive, concerned about getting good grades, and try to learn material so that I can perform better than others.
(5) I am generally turned off as a student, uninterested in class activities, and don't care to work with teachers or other students.

48. About how much time and effort have you put into this course compared to other courses of equal credit?
(1) much more
(2) somewhat more
(3) about the same amount
(4) somewhat less
(5) much less

49. Generally, how valuable have you found the assigned readings in terms of their contribution to your learning in this course?
(1) very valuable
(2) fairly valuable
(3) not very valuable
(4) there have been no assigned readings

50. Overall, I would rate this course as:
(1) excellent
(2) good
(3) mediocre
(4) poor

APPENDIX B

SKILLS OF STUDENTING

SKILLS OF STUDENTING

Course Skill Ranking

	Extremely Important	Important	Unimportant	Extremely Unimportant	Not Applicable
1. Classification-ability to group material by virtue of common properties	A	B	C	D	E
2. Listening-ability to listen to what is being said, withholding judgment until the statement is completed	A	B	C	D	E
3. Study concentration-ability to focus one's consciousness on the material at hand for required periods in private study.	A	B	C	D	E
4. Classroom concentration-ability to concentrate during class sessions to learn the material.	A	B	C	D	E
5. Level of importance-ability to discriminate between the relative importance of materials	A	B	C	D	E
6. Logical organization-ability to organize materials into systemic logical structures.	A	B	C	D	E
7. Note-taking-ability to record key points from lecture material and private study.	A	B	C	D	E
8. Memorization-ability to retain and readily recall selected data.	A	B	C	D	E
9. Reading-ability to read with speed and comprehension, and interpretation within context.	A	B	C	D	E

	Extremely Important	Important	Unimportant	Extremely Unimportant	Not Applicable
10. Pacing-ability to regulate input to a digestable level.	A	B	C	D	E
11. Work planning-spreading course assignments satisfactorily week by week through semester.	A	B	C	D	E
12. Closure-ability to sum up key points of materials in an understandable fashion.	A	B	C	D	E
13. Knowledge of study facilities-knowledge of what study resources are available and where to find them.	A	B	C	D	E
14. Use of study facilities-ability to use study facilities to maximum effect.	A	B	C	D	E
15. Use of alternative resources-knowledge of alternative learning options and the ability to use them as aids to learning.	A	B	C	D	E
16. Theory formation-ability to abstract theoretical constructs from materials learned.	A	B	C	D	E
17. Learning integration-ability to understand problem-centered learning from a variety of disciplinary points of view.	A	B	C	D	E
18. Problem solving-ability to relate facts and experiences to strategies already internalized, in order to solve problems.	A	B	C	D	E

	Extremely Important	Important	Unimportant	Extremely Unimportant	Not Applicable
19. Skimming-ability to skim large amounts of information and retain relevant points.	A	B	C	D	E
20. Creativity-ability to generate new and unique uses for materials	A	B	C	D	E
21. Awareness of bias-ability to evaluate materials with awareness of religious, cultural, political, philosophical, etc., bias.	A	B	C	D	E
22. Acceptance of bias-assessing the bias of other people before incorporating it into your own work.	A	B	C	D	E
23. Oral expression-ability to clearly state one's knowledge orally.	A	B	C	D	E
24. Written expression-ability to clearly state one's knowledge in writing.	A	B	C	D	E
25. Vocabulary-command of the language necessary to understand materials.	A	B	C	D	E
26. Ease of participation-ability to become actively involved in discussion sessions.	A	B	C	D	E
27. Participation effectiveness-ability to make stimulating comments in discussion sessions.	A	B	C	D	E
28. Questioning-ability to ask what one desires to learn.	A	B	C	D	E
29. Challenging-ability to ask challenging questions concerning possible weaknesses in the argument.	A	B	C	D	E

	Extremely Important	Important	Unimportant	Extremely Unimportant	Not Applicable
30. Tutoring-ability to effectively explain material to another individual.	A	B	C	D	E
31. Enthusiasm-excitement about learning and discovering for one's self.	A	B	C	D	E
32. Sampling-knowing how to monitor courses before signing up for them.	A	B	C	D	E
33. Involvement-active involvement in learning: "getting into" the learning process.	A	B	C	D	E
34. Nonverbal communication-communication of information without use of language.	A	B	C	D	E
35. Empathy-viewing materials as others view it.	A	B	C	D	E
36. Positive interaction-forming positive learning relationships with other student learners.	A	B	C	D	E
37. Positive regard-having positive feelings toward teachers.	A	B	C	D	E
38. Cueing-ability to keep the teacher informed about one's attitudes and feelings continually.	A	B	C	D	E
39. Course selection-using the correct criteria to select or bail out of courses for personal study programs.	A	B	C	D	E
40. Study negotiation-ability to negotiate with administration and faculty for courses and independent study contracts.	A	B	C	D	E

	Extremely Important	Important	Unimportant	Extremely Unimportant	Not Applicable
41. Role selection-knowing when to adopt the role of learner and when to play other roles which actively facilitate communication.	A	B	C	D	E
42. Self-discipline-ability to determine study objectives and complete them.	A	B	C	D	E
43. Delayed gratification-the acceptance of required means to achieve a valued goal even if some of the means seem irrelevant.	A	B	C	D	E
44. Self-confidence-the ability of the student to believe in his competence and skills to study well.	A	B	C	D	E
45. Personal relevance-ability to match course objectives with personal objectives.	A	B	C	D	E
46. Self-direction-knowing one's own personal learning objectives.	A	B	C	D	E
47. Preferences-awareness of the correct use of personal taste in learning course material.	A	B	C	D	E
48. Priorities-ability to be clear minded and consistent in expressing one's overall attitudes and priorities.	A	B	C	D	E
49. Priority action-ability to follow personal priorities conscientiously.	A	B	C	D	E
50. Peer acceptance-ability to grant equal tolerance and respect to the views of fellow students.	A	B	C	D	E

	Extremely Important	Important	Unimportant	Extremely Unimportant	Not Applicable
51. Level of challenge-ability to meet the appropriate level of competence demanded by the material.	A	B	C	D	E
52. Psychomotor stimulation-knowing the importance of when to study and when to stop, and how much time to devote to physical exercise.	A	B	C	D	E
53. Teacher attitudes-knowing how to identify the personal attitudes of the teacher.	A	B	C	D	E
54. Identification-using the teacher as a guide for professional attitudes and behavior associated with his/her role.	A	B	C	D	E
55. Positive contribution-ability to experience a sense of satisfaction from positive contributions to discussion sessions.	A	B	C	D	E
56. Evaluation-ability to regard class tests as a means of positive feedback of course progress rather than a judgment of overall ability.	A	B	C	D	E
57. Test wiseness-knowing the right techniques to perform well at multiple choice, oral, essay type, etc., examinations.	A	B	C	D	E
58. Examinations-ability to pace an examination to give adequate time to every required section.	A	B	C	D	E
59. Cooperation-having a positive sense of working with teachers and peers as a team in the pursuit of learning.	A	B	C	D	E

	Extremely Important	Important	Unimportant	Extremely Unimportant	Not Applicable
60. Time allocation-ability to allocate enough time for a broad range of student activities including study, exercise, socialization, and outside campus affairs.	A	B	C	D	E
61. Intellectual stimulation-being able to find enough intellectual stimulation in the campus environment to continue to learn.	A	B	C	D	E
62. Environmental warmth-being able to find enough affective warmth in the campus environment to continue to learn.	A	B	C	D	E
63. Achievement motivation-being aware there is sufficient internalized achievement motivation to succeed in college.	A	B	C	D	E

APPENDIX C

PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE OF FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE PERCEPTIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS/AMHERST

Section I.

Listed below are a number of ways to describe the roles that a faculty member might assume in the classroom. They have been derived from a search of higher education literature. Please rate each role on the basis of:

A. how much <u>emphasis</u> you give to that role in the classroom;

B. how <u>satisfying</u> you find that role to be in the classroom;

C. how <u>well-trained</u> you feel you are to handle that role in the classroom.

Please indicate your ratings of each role on each of the scales by circling the number below each scale which most corresponds to your views. The ratings are from high to low:

	High			Low
	1	2	3	4	5
A.	Great emphasis on this role		Moderate emphasis on this role		Little emphasis on this role
B.	Great satisfaction from this role		Moderate satisfaction from this role		Little satisfaction from this role
C.	Well-trained for this role		Moderately well-trained for this role		Poorly trained for this role

ROLES	A Emphasis High				Low	B Satisfaction High				Low	C Training High				Low
1, 2, 3 TEACHER AS INFORMATION PROCESSOR Motto: "I organize a body of information, facts, perspectives and concepts from my academic discipline and transmit this information to my students."	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4, 5, 6 TEACHER AS GUIDE Motto: "I expose students to those appropriate portions of my academic field which coincide with the pursuit of their own concerns and interests."	4					5					6				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7, 8, 9 TEACHER AS EXAMPLE Motto: "I model the characteristics typical of professional scholars who pursue my discipline."	7					8					9				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

	High 1	2	3	4	Low 5
A.	Great emphasis on this role		Moderate emphasis on this role		Little emphasis on this role
B.	Great satisfaction from this role		Moderate satisfaction from this role		Little satisfaction from this role
C.	Well-trained for this role		Moderately well-trained for this role		Poorly trained for this role

ROLES	A Emphasis High				Low	B Satisfaction High				Low	C Training High				Low
10, 11, 12 TEACHER AS CREDENTIALING AGENT Motto: "I train students in technical skills and competencies."	10					11					12				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
13, 14, 15 TEACHER AS RECRUITER Motto: "I reinforce students who have the potential for excellence in my field to pursue advanced study."	13					14					15				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
16, 17, 18 TEACHER AS CATALYST Motto: "I open students to new vistas in experience and self-analysis."	16					17					18				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
19, 20, 21 TEACHER AS TASKMASTER Motto: "I capture the attention of students and channel it toward instructional activities which I have chosen."	19					20					21				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
22, 23, 24 TEACHER AS AUTHORITY FIGURE Motto: "I transmit value systems of the adult world to young adults."	22					23					24				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
25, 26, 27 TEACHER AS SCREENER Motto: "I discourage students who may have an interest but lack the ability for a career in my field."	25					26					27				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Remember, the ratings are from high to low:

175

	High 1	2	3	4	Low 5
A.	Great emphasis on this role		Moderate emphasis on this role		Little emphasis on this role
B.	Great satisfaction from this role		Moderate satisfaction from this role		Little satisfaction from this role
C.	Well-trained for this role		Moderately well-trained for this role		Poorly trained for this role

ROLES	A Emphasis High	A Emphasis Low	B Satisfaction High	B Satisfaction Low	C Training High	C Training Low
28, 29, 30 TEACHER AS PERSON Motto: "I allow students to see me as I am by using my senses, emotions, imagination and will in addition to my intellect in investigating and presenting subject matter."	28		29		30	
	1 2 3 4 5		1 2 3 4 5		1 2 3 4 5	
31, 32, 33 TEACHER AS MANAGER Motto: "I show students how to manage their own learning."	31		32		33	
	1 2 3 4 5		1 2 3 4 5		1 2 3 4 5	
34, 35, 36 TEACHER AS RESOURCE Motto: "I present my subject matter in a manner that enables students to interact with me and take away from that interaction what they deem important."	34		35		36	
	1 2 3 4 5		1 2 3 4 5		1 2 3 4 5	
37, 38, 39 TEACHER AS FACILITATOR Motto: "I provide opportunities for and seek to facilitate the emotional development of my students."	37		38		39	
	1 2 3 4 5		1 2 3 4 5		1 2 3 4 5	

Section II.

Section II contains a number of demographic items. They are included in the questionnaire as an attempt to determine how groups of faculty members perceive their instructional roles. Please circle the appropriate responses on the following items:

40. How long have you been teaching at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst?

1. 0 - less than 1 year
2. 1 - less than 5 years
3. 5 - less than 10 years
4. 10 - less than 15 years
5. 15 - less than 20 years
6. 20 - less than 25 years
7. 25 - less than 30 years
8. 30 - less than 40 years
9. 40 or more years

41. At what type of institution did you previously teach?

1. state university
2. small liberal arts college
3. state college
4. large private university
5. other
6. I've not taught before

42. What was the approximate total enrollment at the institution where you had previously taught?

1. under 5,000
2. 5,000 to less than 10,000
3. 10,000 to less than 15,000
4. 15,000 to less than 20,000
5. 20,000 to less than 25,000
6. 25,000 to less than 30,000
7. 30,000 or more

43. In what general area of knowledge do you teach?

1. social and behavioral sciences
2. humanistics
3. natural sciences and mathematics
4. other (please specify) _____
5. application of knowledge to a vocational training

44. What is your academic rank at this university?

1. professor
2. associate professor
3. assistant professor
4. instructor
5. lecturer

45. How old were you on your last birthday?

1. under 30 years
2. 30 - 35 years
3. 36 - 40 years
4. 41 - 45 years
5. 46 - 50 years
6. 51 - 55 years
7. 56 - 60 years
8. 61 - 65 years

46. At what type of institution did you receive your undergraduate education?

1. state university
2. small liberal arts college
3. state college
4. large private university
5. other (please specify) _____

47. How important do you view the three dimensions of your role as a university faculty member (research, service, teaching)?

How important do you view your research role?

1. Extremely important
2. Important
3. Somewhat important
4. Unimportant

48. How important do you view your teaching role?

1. Extremely important
2. Important
3. Somewhat important
4. Unimportant

49. How important do you view your service role?

1. Extremely important
2. Important
3. Somewhat important
4. Unimportant

50. What is your sex?

1. Male 2. Female

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE OF FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE PERCEPTIONS, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS/AMHERST

Section I.

Listed below are a number of ways to describe the roles that a faculty member might assume in the classroom. They have been derived from a search of higher education literature. Please rate each role on the basis of:

A. how much <u>emphasis</u> you actually give to that role in the classroom;

B. how <u>satisfying</u> you actually find that role to be in the classroom;

C. how <u>well-trained</u> you actually feel you are to handle that role in the classroom.

Please indicate your ratings of each role on each of the scales by circling the number below each scale which most corresponds to your views. The ratings are from high to low:

EMPHASIS (A)		SATISFACTION (B)		TRAINING (C)	
High 1	Great emphasis on this role	High 1	Great satisfaction from this role	High 1	Well-trained for this role
2		2		2	
3	Moderate emphasis on this role	3	Moderate satisfaction from this role	3	Moderately well-trained for this role
4		4		4	
Low 5	Little emphasis on this role	Low 5	Little satisfaction from this role	Low 5	Poorly trained for this role

ROLES	EMPHASIS(A)	SATISFACTION(B)	TRAINING(C)
1. TEACHER AS INFORMATION PROCESSOR Motto: "I organize a body of information, facts, perspectives and concepts from my academic disciplines and transmit this information to my students."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5
2. TEACHER AS GUIDE Motto: "I function as a guide for my students."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5

ROLES	EMPHASIS(A)	SATISFACTION(B)	TRAINING(C)
3. TEACHER AS EXAMPLE Motto: "I convey to my students the habits of mind typical of professional scholars who pursue my discipline."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5
4. TEACHER AS CREDENTIALING AGENT Motto: "I train students in technical skills and competencies."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5
5. TEACHER AS RECRUITER Motto: "I reinforce students who have the potential for excellence in my field to pursue advanced study."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5
6. TEACHER AS CATALYST Motto: "I expose students to new vistas in thought."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5
7. TEACHER AS TASKMASTER Motto: "I capture the attention of students and channel it toward instructional activities which I have chosen."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5

Remember, the ratings are from High to Low:

EMPHASIS (A)			SATISFACTION (B)			TRAINING (C)		
High	1	Great emphasis on this role	High	1	Great satisfaction from this role	High	1	Well-trained for this role
	2			2			2	
	3	Moderate emphasis on this role		3	Moderate satisfaction from this role		3	Moderately well-trained for this role
	4			4			4	
Low	5	Little emphasis on this role	Low	5	Little satisfaction from this role	Low	5	Poorly trained for this role

ROLES	EMPHASIS(A)	SATISFACTION(B)	TRAINING(C)
8. TEACHER AS AUTHORITY FIGURE Motto: "I transmit value systems of the adult world to young adults."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5
9. TEACHER AS SCREENER Motto: "I discourage students who may have an interest but lack the ability for a career in my field."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5
10. TEACHER AS PERSON Motto: "I allow students to see me as I am by using my senses, emotions, imagination and will in addition to my intellect in investigating and presenting subject matter."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5
11. TEACHER AS LEARNER Motto: "I maintain a learning posture by offering my students a model of a person who does not need to know everything, who remains vulnerable and who can inquire in public."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5

ROLES	EMPHASIS(A)	SATISFACTION(B)	TRAINING(C)
12. TEACHER AS RESOURCE Motto: "I present my subject in a manner that allows students to interact with me and take away from that interaction what they deem important."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5
13. TEACHER AS FACILITATOR Motto: "I provide opportunities for and seek to facilitate the social/emotional development of my students."	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5	High 1 2 3 4 Low 5

Section II.

Section II contains a number of demographic items. They are included in the questionnaire in an attempt to determine how groups of faculty members perceive their instructional roles. Please circle the appropriate responses on the following items:

14. Sex?

1. Male
2. Female

15. How old were you on your last birthday?

1. under 30 years
2. 30-35 years
3. 36-40 years
4. 41-45 years
5. 46-50 years
6. 51-55 years
7. 56-60 years
8. 61-65 years

16. At what type of university did you receive your undergraduate education?

1. state university
2. small private liberal arts college
3. state college
4. large private university
5. technical institute
6. other (please specify) _____

17. What is your academic rank at this university?

1. professor
2. associate professor
3. assistant professor
4. instructor
5. lecturer

18. How long have you been teaching at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst?

1. 0 - less than 1 year
2. 1 - less than 5 years
3. 5 - less than 10 years
4. 10 - less than 15 years
5. 15 - less than 20 years
6. 20 - less than 25 years
7. 25 - less than 30 years
8. 30 - less than 40 years
9. 40 or more years

19. At what type of institution did you previously teach?

1. state university
2. small private liberal arts college
3. state college
4. large private university
5. technical institute
6. other (please specify) _____

20. What was the approximate total enrollment at the institution where you had previously taught?

1. under 5,000
2. 5,000 to less than 10,000
3. 10,000 to less than 15,000
4. 15,000 to less than 20,000
5. 20,000 to less than 25,000
6. 25,000 to less than 30,000
7. 30,000 or more

21. In what general area of knowledge do you teach?

1. social and behavioral sciences
2. humanities
3. natural sciences and mathematics
4. other (please specify) _____

22. How important do you view the three dimensions of your role as a university faculty member (research, service, teaching)?

How important do you view your research role?

1. Extremely important
2. Important
3. Somewhat important
4. Unimportant
5. Undecided

23. How important do you view your teaching role?

1. Extremely important
2. Important
3. Somewhat important
4. Unimportant
5. Undecided

24. How important do you view your service role?

1. Extremely important
2. Important
3. Somewhat important
4. Unimportant
5. Undecided

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Adams, Raymond S., and Biddle, Bruce. Realities of Teaching, Explorations with Videotape. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Adler, Alfred. Social Interest: A Challenge to Mankind. New York: Capricorn Books, 1964.

Aichorn, A. Wayward Youth. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.

Allport, Gordon. Becoming. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.

Anastasi, A. Psychological Testing. New York: Macmillan, 1968.

Argyle, M. The Psychology of Interpersonal Behavior. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967.

Astin, Alexander. The College Environment. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Axelrod, Joseph. The University Teacher as Artist. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Baldridge, J. V. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

Bandura, A., and Walters, R. H. Social Learning and Personality Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Banfield, Edward. The Unheavenly City. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1970, pp. 133-157.

Barak, Rosenshine, and Furst, Norma. "The Use of Direct Observation to Study Teaching." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 122-183. Edited by R. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1973.

Bardwick, J. M. Psychology of Women. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Barzun, Jacques. The American University. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Beard, Ruth, ed. Objectives in Higher Education. London: Society for Research in Higher Education, 1968.

Bendiner, R. The Politics of Schools. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Benne, K., and Sheats, P. "Functional Roles of Group Members." In Perspectives on the Group Process, pp. 319-324. Edited by C. Kemp and C. Gratton. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964.

Berger, P., and Luckmann, T. The Social Construction of Reality. Gardon City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1967.

Bidwell, C. "The Social Psychology of Teaching." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 413-449. Edited by R. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1973.

Bigge, Morris. Learning Theories for Teachers. New York: Harper and Row, 1971, chaps. i, x.

Bingham, T., and Moore, H. How to Interview. New York: Harper and Row, 1941.

Birdwhistell, R. Kinesics and Context. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.

Blount, N. S. "Research on Teaching Literature, Language and Composition." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 1072-1096. Edited by R. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1973.

Blum, Gerald S. Psychoanalytic Theories of Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1953.

Blumer, Herbert. Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Brookover, W., and Erickson, Edsel. Society Schools and Learning. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969, pp. 99-113.

Brookover, W., and Gottlieb, D. "Teacher Roles and Teacher Personality." In A Sociology of Education, pp. 357-388. New York: American Book Co., 1964.

Brown, George I. Human Teaching for Human Learning. New York: Viking Press, 1971.

Bruner, Jerome. The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Callahan, R. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Carkhuff, R. The Art of Helping. Amherst, Mass.: Human Resources Development Press, 1972.

Charters, W. W., Jr. "The Social Background of Teaching." In Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 715-813. Edited by N. L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963.

Clark, Burton. The Distinctive College. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1970.

Clark, Kenneth B. Dark Ghetto. New York: Harper and Co., 1965.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Associates. A Constant Variable. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Coles, Henry. Process Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1972.

Combs, Arthur; Avila, D.; and Purkey, W. Helping Relationships. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Coopersmith, Stanley. Antecedents to Self-Esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1967.

Cross, Patricia. Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Douvan, E., and Adelson, J. The Adolescent Experience. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Eble, Kenneth. Professors as Teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Editors of Change. Inside Academe. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change, NBW Tower, 1972.

Elkin, Frederick. The Child and Society. New York: Random House, 1960.

Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1950.

Fenker, R., and Leigh, Sucrest. "Teacher Evaluation at Texas Christian University: An Analysis of the Perceived Roles of Faculty by Students, Administrators, and Faculty." In Innovative Teaching: Issues, Strategies, and Evaluation, pp. 321-352. Cleveland, Ohio: Center for Effective Learning, Cleveland State University, 1973.

Fink, Martin B. "Self-concept as It Relates to Underachievement." In Underachievement, pp. 46-60. Edited by Milton Kornrich. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas Co., 1965.

Flanders, N. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970.

Flavell, J. H. The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1963.

Flournoy, Don, and Associates. The New Teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Ford, Donald, and Urban, Hugh B. Systems of Psychotherapy. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1963.

Frankl, V. E. From Death Camp to Existentialism. Translated by I. Lasch. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.

Freud, Sigmund. Civilization and its Discontents. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1961.

_____. The Future of an Illusion. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1964.

Fromm, Eric. The Art of Loving. New York: Harper and Bros., 1956.

_____. Man for Himself. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Gage, N. L. Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Education. Palo Alto, Calif.: Pacific Books, 1972, pp. 188-206.

Gilmore, J. "The Factor of Attention in Underachievement." In Principles of Psychodiagnosis, pp. 1-41. Boston: Boston University, 1971.

Goffman, E. Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1959.

Goldstein, Kurt. Human Nature. New York: Schocken Books, 1963.

Grambs, Jean Dresden. Schools, Scholars and Society. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965, pp. 104-123.

Grant, Barbara, and Hennings, Dorothy. The Teacher Moves. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

Gronlund, Norman. Stating Behavioral Objectives for Classroom Instruction. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1970.

Gross, Neal; Mason, W.; and McEachern, A. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Haber, Audrey, and Runyon, R. General Statistics. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1971, pp. 14-16.

Haley, A., and Malcolm, S. The Autobiography of Malcolm X. New York: Grove Press, 1964.

Hall, Edward T. The Hidden Dimension. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1966.

_____. The Silent Language. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, 1959.

Hansen, Loren; Jensen, Jesper; with Roberts, Wallace. The Little Red Schoolbook. New York: Pocketbooks, 1971.

Harrington, Michael. The Other America. New York: Macmillan, 1962.

Harris, Thomas. I'm O.K., You're O.K. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Healey, F. G., and Holloway, P. J. "The Classical Objectives of University Teaching." In Objectives in Higher Education, pp. 24-40. Edited by Ruth Beard. London: Society for Research in Higher Education, 1968.

Henry, Jules. Culture Against Man. New York: Random House, 1963.

Hersey, Paul, and Blanchard, Kenneth A. Management of Organizational Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Hildebrand, Milton; Wilson, Robert C.; and Dienst, Evelyn R. Evaluating University Teaching. Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1971.

Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Hook, Sidney, ed. In Defense of Academic Freedom. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1971.

Hutchins, R. The Higher Learning in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

Jackson, Philip. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Jencks, C. Inequality. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Jencks, C., and Riesman, D. The Academic Revolution. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1968.

Jersild, Arthur. When Teachers Face Themselves. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1955.

Kagan, Jerome, ed. Creativity and Learning. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Kalm, Robert, and Connell, Charles F. The Dynamics of Interviewing. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1957.

Kamil, Alan, and Simonsen, N. Patterns of Psychology. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1973.

Katz, M. The Irony of Early School Reform. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Kell, Bill L., and Mueller, William J. Impact and Change: A Study of Counseling Relationships. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Keniston, K. Young Radicals. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.

Kesey, Ken. One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest. New York: Signet Books, 1962.

Kluckholm, Clyde. Mirror for Man. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1949.

Knapp, Robert H. "Changing Functions of the College Professor." In The American College, pp. 290-311. Edited by Nevitt Sanford. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Knoblock, Peter, and Goldstein, Arnold. The Lonely Teacher. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Krathwohl, B.; Bloom, B. S.; and Masia, B. B. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook II, Affective Domain. New York: David McKay, 1964.

Krug, Edward A. Curriculum Planning. New York: Harper and Bros., 1957.

Laing, R. D. The Politics of Experience. New York: Pantheon Book--A Division of Random House, 1967.

_____. The Self and Others. London: Tavistock Publications, 1961.

Lana, R., and Rosnow, R. Introduction to Contemporary Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Lecky, P. Self-Consistency. New York: Island Press Cooperative, 1951.

Lewin, Kurt. Field Theory in Social Science. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Lindesmith, A., and Strauss, A. Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Lindzey, Gardner, and Hall, Calvin. Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

McCarthy, Mary. The Groves of Academe. New York: Signet Books, 1963.

McDonald, D. Against the American Grain. New York: Random House, 1965.

McHugh, Peter. Defining the Situation. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1968.

McKeachie, Wilbert. "Procedures and Techniques of Teaching: A Survey of Experimental Studies." In The American College, pp. 312-364. Edited by N. Sanford. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

_____. "Research on Teaching at the College and University Level." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 1119-1172. Edited by R. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1973.

_____. Teaching Tips, A Guidebook for Beginning College Teachers. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1969.

MacKinnon, D. "Nature and Nurture of Creative Talent." In Psychological Foundations of Education, pp. 62-78. Edited by W. H. MacGintie and S. Ball. New York: Selected Academic Readings, 1965.

McLuhan, M. Understanding Media: The Extension of Man. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.

McNeil, John D., and Popham, James W. "The Assessment of Teacher Competence." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 218-244. Edited by R. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1973.

Mager, Robert. Preparing Behavioral Objectives. Palo Alto, Calif.: Trearson Publishers, 1962.

Manis, J., and Meltzer, B. Symbolic Interaction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.

Mann, R.; Arnold, S.; Binder, J.; Cytrynbaum, S.; Newman, B.; Ringwald, B.; and Rosenwein, J. The College Classroom: Conflict, Change, and Learning. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970.

Maslow, Abraham. Motivation and Personality. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1954.

_____. The Psychology of Science. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1966.

_____. Toward a Psychology of Being. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1968.

Matza, David. Becoming Deviant. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

May, R. Existential Psychology. New York: Random House, 1961.

Mayhew, Lewis B. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Mead, G. H. "Genesis of the Self." In The Self in Social Interaction, pp. 51-60. Edited by Chad Gordon and K. Gergen. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.

_____. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Medinnus, Gene, ed. Readings in the Psychology of Parent-Child Relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Miller, G. A. "Some Preliminaries to Psycholinguistics." In Language, pp. 202-212. Edited by R. C. Oldfield and J. C. Marshall. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1968.

Miller, R. I. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Minium, Edward. Statistical Reasoning in Psychology and Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970, pp. 208-220.

Moser, C. A. Survey Methods in Social Investigation. London: Heinemann, 1958, pp. 127-131.

Mosher, R., and Purpel, D. Supervision: the Reluctant Profession. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1972.

Mouly, George. The Science of Educational Research. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1970.

Munroe, Ruth. Schools of Psychoanalytic Thought. New York: Holt and Co., 1955.

Neill, A. S. Summerhill. New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1960.

Nie, N.; Bent, D.; and Hull, C. Hadlai. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Nierenberg, G., and Calero, H. How to Read a Person Like a Book. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1971.

Nierenberg, G., and Calero, H. Meta-talk. New York: Pocket Books, 1975.

Nisbet, R. The Degradation of the Academic Dogma: the University in America, 1945-1970. New York: Basic Books, 1971, pp. 1-22.

Nuthall, G., and Snook, I. "Contemporary Models of Teaching." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 47-72. Edited by R. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1973.

Oettinger, Anthony G. Run, Computer, Run. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Parsons, Talcott. "The Position of Identity in the General Theory of Action." In The Self in Social Interaction, pp. 11-24. Edited by C. Gordon and K. Gergin. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.

Polanyi, M. The Tacit Dimension. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1967.

Postman, Neil, and Weingartner, Charles. Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.

Reich, C. The Greening of America. New York: Random House, 1970.

Remmers, H. H., and Radler, D. H. The American Teenager. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1957.

Riesman, D.; Glazer, N.; and Denney, R. The Lonely Crowd. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1955.

Riesman, D.; Gusfield, J.; and Gamson, Z. Academic Values and Mass Education. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1971.

Rogers, Carl. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1961.

_____. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969.

Rogers, Raymond. Coming into Existence. Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1967.

Rosenblith, Judy, and Allensmith, Wesley. The Causes of Behavior. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970.

Rosenzweig, M., and Porter, L. W., eds. "The Keller Plan." In 1974 Annual Review of Psychology, pp. 171-172. Palo Alto, Calif.: Annual Reviews, Inc., 1974.

Roszak, Theodore. The Making of a Counter Culture. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1969.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Runkel, P.; Harrison, R.; and Runkel, M. The Changing College Classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Ryans, David G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Schmuck, R., and Schmuck, P. Group Processes in the Classroom. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1973.

Schutz, Alfred. "Multiple Realities." In The Self in Social Interaction, pp. 61-71. Edited by C. Gordon and K. Gergen. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Skinner, B. F. Walden Two. New York: Macmillan, 1948.

Slater, P. The Pursuit of Loneliness. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.

Slobin, Dan. Psycholinguistics. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1971.

Snow, C. P. The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution. London: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Spady, William. "Authority, Conflict, and Teacher Effectiveness." In Yearbook of Education, pp. 4-10. Edited by C. Wayne Gordon. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1974.

Spring, Joel. Education and the Rise of the Corporate State. Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.

Stewart, Campbell. "The Place of Higher Education in a Changing Society." In The American College, pp. 918-919. Edited by Nevitt Sanford. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Stone, G., and Farberman, H. Social Psychology through Symbolic Interaction. Waltham, Mass.: Xerox College Publishing, 1970.

Strauss, Anselm. The Social Psychology of George Herbert Mead. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Szasz, Thomas S. The Myth of Mental Illness. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1961.

Terkel, S. Working. New York: Avon Books, 1974.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.

_____. Learning for Tomorrow. New York: Vintage Books, 1972.

Trent, J., and Cohen, A. "Research on Teaching in Higher Education." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 997-1071. Edited by R. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1973.

Tyler, R. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1932.

Watts, Alan. Psychotherapy: East and West. New York: New American Library, 1963.

Weil, B. Joyce. Models of Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Whitehead, A. N. The Aims of Education. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Wilson, R.; Gaff, J.; Dienst, E.; Wood, L.; and Bavry, J. College Professors and Their Impact on Students. New York: Wiley Interscience, 1975.

Wolff, Robert Paul. The Ideal of the University. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Pamphlets

Administrative Officers and Faculty List. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1973.

Eble, Kenneth. Career Development of the Effective College Teacher. Washington, D.C.: AAUP Press, November 1971.

_____. The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching. Salt Lake City, Utah: Project to Improve College Teaching, 1971.

The Group for Human Development in Higher Education. Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine, 1974.

Hanson, Richard, ed. University Directions 1973. Amherst, Mass.: University Publications Office, 1973.

Undergraduate Courses and Faculty. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1973.

Reports

Clinic to Improve University Teaching. Annual Report, 1972-1973 to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Amherst: School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1973.

Coleman, J. S. Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Magid, L., and Thomas, N. Course and Teacher Evaluation: A Student Perspective. Amherst: Student Center for Educational Research, University of Massachusetts, Spring 1975.

Mitchell, Maurice B. Faculty Power and the U.S. Campus. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 1-10.

Newman, Frank, ed. Report on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1971.

Reimanis, Gunars. "Teaching Effectiveness and the Interaction between Teaching Methods, Student and Teacher Characteristics." Project Report. Corning, N.Y.: Corning Community College, for U.S. Office of Education, HEW, Bureau of Research, 1972.

Rothwell, C. Easton. The Importance of Teaching. Report of Commission on Teaching Undergraduates. New Haven, Conn.: Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Teaching, Hazen Foundation, 1968.

Special Task Force to the Secretary of HEW. Work in America. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1973.

Stanfield, R., and Shumer, H. Changing Role Concepts of College Students. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, August 1967.

Wood, Robert. Report of the President, University of Massachusetts; Amherst, Worcester, Boston. Amherst: University Publications Office, 1973.

Articles

Alkinson, R., and Shiffrin, R. "The Control of Short-Term Memory." Scientific American, October 1970, pp. 41-47.

Arden, E. "Faculty as Teachers." Educational Forum 32 (May 1968): 447-452.

Baird, Leonard. "Teaching Styles: an Exploratory Study of Dimensions and Effects." Journal of Educational Psychology 64 (1973): 15-21.

Bank, Stephen. "Unlocking Relationships in the University." Wesleyan University Alumnus (Middletown, Conn.), Winter 1969-70, pp. 1-6.

Bayer, Alan. "College Faculties: Le Plus Ca Change . . ." Change, March 1974, pp. 49-64.

Bayley, D. H. "Making College Teaching a Profession." Improving College and University Teaching 15 (1967): 115-120.

Berquist, W., and Phillips, S. "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program." Journal of Higher Education 46 (March/April 1975): 177-211.

Bessell, H. "The Content is the Medium: the Confidence is the Message." Psychology Today, January 1968, pp. 32-35.

Birch, E.; Brandt, J.; Heath, R.; and Southwick, R. "The Campus Environment '74." NASPA Called. Delaware, Ohio: Ohio Wesleyan University, 1974, p. 3.

Boocock, Sarane. "Toward a Sociology of Learning: a Selective Review of Existing Research." Sociology of Education 59 (Winter 1966): 2-44.

Breneman, David. "Decisions of the Decade for Graduate Education." Educational Record 54 (Summer 1973): 220-225.

Brûner, Jerome. "The Process of Education Revisited." Phi Delta Kappan, September 1971, pp. 18-21.

Centra, John. "The Student as Godfather? The Impact of Student Ratings on Academia." Educational Researcher 2 (October 1973): 4-8.

Chickering, Arthur. "Undergraduate Academic Experience." Journal of Educational Psychology 63 (1972): 134-143.

Clark, B. "The 'Cooling Out' Function in Higher Education." American Journal of Sociology 45 (May 1960): 569-576.

Coelho, G.; Hamburg, D.; and Murphy, E. "Coping Strategies in a New Learning Environment." Archives of General Psychiatry 9 (November 1963): 433-443.

Cohen, Elizabeth. "Sociology and the Classroom: Setting the Conditions for Teacher-Student Interaction." Review of Educational Research 42 (1970): 441-451.

Coleman, James S. "The Children Have Outgrown the Schools." Psychology Today, February 1972, pp. 72-82.

Combs, Arthur W. "New Concepts of Human Potential." Childhood Education, April 1971, p. 352.

Costin, F.; Greenough, W.; and Menges, R. "Student Ratings of College Teaching: Reliability, Validity and Usefulness." Review of Educational Research 41 (1971): 511-531.

Dunham, E. Alden. "A Look at Princeton Admissions." Reprinted from Princeton Alumni Weekly 65 (19 January 1965).

Dupont, R. L. "Rise and Fall of Heroin Addiction." Natural History 33 (1974): 66-69.

Erikson, Erik. "The Quest for Identity." Newsweek, 2 December 1970, pp. 85-89.

Etzels, J. W., and Guba, E. G. "The Strength of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation." Journal of Educational Sociology 29 (1955): 30-40.

Evans, Gary, and Howard, R. "Personal Space." Psychological Bulletin 80 (1973): 334-344.

Farson, R. E. "Praise Reappraised." Harvard Business Review, September-October 1963, pp. 61-66.

Friedlander, Bernard. "A Psychologist's Second Thoughts on Concepts, Curiosity, and Discovery in Teaching and Learning." Harvard Educational Review 35 (Winter 1965): 136-155.

Gaff, J. "Making a Difference: The Impacts of Faculty." The Journal of Higher Education 44 (November 1973): 605-622.

Gagne, Robert M. "Educational Technology and the Learning Process." Educational Researcher 3 (1974): 3-8.

_____. "Some New Views of Learning and Instruction." Phi Delta Kappan, October 1970, pp. 38-45.

Gergen, Kenneth. "Multiple Identity. The Healthy Happy Human Being Wears Many Masks." Psychology Today, May 1972, pp. 31-35.

Hall, Peter M. "A Symbolic Interactionist Analysis of Politics." Sociological Inquiry, Summer 1972, pp. 54-62.

Haney, John. "Television." Instructor, February 1971, pp. 51-60.

Hechinger, Grace, and Hechinger, Fred. "In the Time It Takes You to Read These Lines, the American Teen-ager Will Have Spent $2,378.22." Esquire, July 1972, pp. 65-69.

Heiss, Ann. "Berkeley Doctoral Students Appraise Their Academic Programs." Educational Record 48 (1967): 30-44.

Hess, E. "Imprinting in Animals." Scientific American 198 (March 1958): 81-90.

Hewitt, John P., and Hall, Peter M. "Social Problems, Problematic Situations, and Quasi-Theories." American Sociological Review 38 (1973): 367-374.

Hildebrand, M. "The Characteristics and Skills of the Effective Professor." Journal of Higher Education 44 (1973): 41-50.

Hollister, Bernard. "The Martian Perspective." Media and Methods 3 (November 1973): 26-32.

Keniston, K. "A Second Look at the Uncommitted." Social Policy, July-August 1971, pp. 6-19.

Knop, E. "The Student Dilemma: Role Conflict." Improving College and University Teaching 17 (Summer 1969): 171-180.

Kosinski, Jerzy. "A Nation of Videots." Media and Methods, April 1975, pp. 24-32.

Krech, David. "The Chemistry of Learning." Saturday Review 20 (January 1968): 81.

Lacognata, A. A. "University Extension Faculty and Student Role Expectations--An Empirical Analysis." Journal of Experimental Education 33 (1964): 107-120.

Leichter, Hope J. "The Concept of Educative Style." Columbia Teachers College Record, December 1973, pp. 240-245.

McGrath, Earl. "Characteristics of Outstanding College Teachers." Journal of Higher Education 33 (March 1962): 148-152.

McKeachie, W. J. "Conflict and Style in the College Classroom - an Intimate Study." Psychology Today, February 1971, pp. 47-52.

Morris, Celia. "A Call for Faculty Reform." Change, Winter 1973-74, p. 15.

Mosher, Ralph, and Sprinthall, Norman. "Psychological Education: a Means to Promote Personal Development During Adolescence." The Counseling Psychologist 2 (1971): 3-77.

Page, Smith. "Teaching, Research and Publications as They Affect Academic Promotion and Performance." Journal of Higher Education 32 (1961): 81-89.

Parsons, Talcott, and Platt, Gerald. "Introduction: The Structure of the Academic Professions." Sociology of Education 47 (Winter 1974): 2-28.

Perlberg, A. "Microteaching: A New Process to Improving Teaching and Training." Journal of Educational Technology 1 (January 1970): 35-43.

Perlberg, A.; Peri, J.; and Weinreb, M. "Microteaching and Video Tape Recordings: A New Approach to Improving Teaching." Journal of Medical Education 47 (January 1972): 43-50.

Pietsch, Paul. "Shuffle Brain." Harper's Magazine, May 1972, pp. 41-48.

Rist, Ray. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." Harvard Educational Review 40 (August 1970): 411-451.

Rosensweig, M.; Bennett, E.; and Diamond, M. "Brain Changes in Response to Experience." Scientific American, August 1971, pp. 22-30.

Royer, G., and Cable, G. "Facilitated Learning in Connected Discourse." Journal of Educational Psychology 67 (1975): 116-123.

Sargent, Jon. "Detours: The Road Ahead for College Graduates." Occupational Outlook Quarterly 18 (Summer 1974): 1-5.

Schrag, Peter. "End of the Impossible Dream." Saturday Review, 19 September 1970, pp. 68-70.

Schroeder, Roger. "A Survey of Management Science in University Operations." Management Science 19 (April 1973): 895-906.

Smock, R., and Crooks, T. "A Plan for the Comprehensive Evaluation of College Teaching." Journal of Higher Education 45 (November 1973): 577-586.

Stein, A., and Bailey, M. "The Socialization of Achievement Orientation in Females." Psychological Bulletin 80 (November 1973): 345-366.

Spurr, Stephen. "The American Graduate School." The Graduate Journal 8 (1971): 2-14.

"The Changing Need of Youth." Editorial. Saturday Review of Literature, 20 February 1971, p. 22.

Van Pelt, W. Austin. "Instructional Theory and Student Subcultures." Improving College and University Teaching 17 (Spring 1969): 116-121.

Walhout, Donald. "The Teacher Image in America." Journal of Higher Education 32 (January 1961): 31-35.

Weber, C. A. "Some Characteristics of College Teachers." Journal of Educational Research 46 (1953): 685-692.

West, Rinda. "How Power Works." Media and Methods, January 1974, pp. 24-30.

Whitefield, R., and Brammer, L. "The Ills of College Teaching: Diagnosis and Prescription." Journal of Higher Education 44 (January 1973): 1-13.

Newspapers

Coons, P. "All People Rated Equally Intelligent--an Interview with Jerome Kagan." Boston Globe, 5 May 1974, p. 17.

Editorial Projects for Education, Inc. "Can We Save the Individuality of our Colleges?" Tufts University Criterion, June 1973, pp. 1-2.

Editorial Projects for Education, Inc. "13 Big Issues for Higher Education." American Alumni Council, 1973, pp. 1-15.

Fusco, D. "Chancellor Bromery: U Mass Goals Must Be Defined." Massachusetts Daily Collegian, 19 September 1974, p. 1.

Marx, A. "Recession Found Good for Higher Education." Amherst Record, 13 April 1975, p. 4.

Neumann, Jonathan. "U Mass Faculty Salaries Continue Upward Push: Some 143 Staff Members Earn at Least $30,000." Daily Hampshire Gazette, 15 May 1974, p. 5.

"N.E. Student Growth Shows Rise." Daily Hampshire Gazette, 3 June 1974, p. 6.

Porter, Sylvia. "College a Good but Costly Investment." Daily Hampshire Gazette, 5 April 1974, p. 7.

"Public Aid for Private Colleges." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 20 January 1975, p. 7.

"The Big Eight An Export Industry." Tufts University Criterion, October 1974, p. 4.

"What Kind of Education, What Kind of Jobs?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, 20 January 1975, p. 6.

Wood, Robert. Commencement Address, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, June 1974. Daily Hampshire Gazette, 1 June 1974, p. 5.

Book Reviews

Davis, James. Review of Higher Education: Myths and Realities. Edited by William Godwin and Peter Mann. Journal of Higher Education, November 1973, p. 659.

Greene, Maxine. Review of The Greening of America, by Charles Reich. Columbia Teachers College Record 72 (May 1971): 505-512.

Lacy, A. Review of College Professors and Their Impact on Students, by R. Wilson, J. Gaff, E. Dienst, L. Wood, and J. Bavry. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 19 May 1975, p. 10.

Saurman, Kenneth. Review of University Teacher as Artist, by Joseph Axelrod. Journal of Higher Education 45 (June 1974): 482-485.

Maps

"Distribution of the Foreign Born." American History Atlas. Maplewood, N.J.: G. S. Hammond and Co., 1963, p. A-27.

Unpublished Materials

Adams, P. "Sociological Factors in Teaching Improvement." Paper for the Clinic to Improve University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1973. (Xeroxed.)

Alexander, Lawrence. "Writing Learning Objectives." Michigan State University, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

Allen, D. "Teacher Improvement--We Know Enough to Start." Paper for the International Conference on Improving University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/ Amherst, October 1974. (Xeroxed.)

Allen, D., and Camerino, P. "The Development of a Clinic to Improve University Teaching." Paper prepared for the School of Education, University of Massachusetts/ Amherst, 1972. (Xeroxed.)

American Council on Education. Office of Research. "Summary of Data on Entering Freshmen - University of Massachusetts/Amherst, Fall 1972." (Xeroxed.)

Brickell, Henry. "Teaching and Learning." Superintendent of Schools Office, Manhasset, New York, 1969. (Xeroxed.)

Clinic to Improve University Teaching. "Faculty Attitudes Towards Evaluation and Teaching Improvement." Amherst: School of Education, University of Massachusetts/ Amherst, 1974. (Xeroxed.)

_____. "Sociological Factors in Teaching Improvement." Amherst: School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "The Relationship Between the TABS Instructional Skills Items and the TABS General Background Items." Amherst: School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1974. (Xeroxed.)

_____. "TABS Item Response Summaries." Amherst: School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1974. (Xeroxed.)

"Distribution of Personnel by Race and Sex." Summary paper for Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1972-73 and 1974-75. (Xeroxed.)

Dorris, W. "Alternative Approaches to Teaching Large University Psychology Courses: Going Beyond Information-giving." Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, Fall 1974. (Xeroxed.)

_____. "Comparing Student and Faculty Approaches to Social Psychology: A Consideration of Factors Relevant to Improving Undergraduate Teaching." Psychology Department, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, August 1973. (Xeroxed.)

Eggert, W., and Moore, J. "The Development of a Procedure to Encourage Certain Facilitative Behaviors of Classroom Teachers." Simon Fraser University, February 1973. (Xeroxed.)

Erickson, Glenn. "A Study of Self-Esteem and Academic Self-Concepts of Ability and Randomly Grouped Ninth Graders." Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1972.

Fukuda, N. "Organizational Concepts to Enhance Instruction." Paper for the International Conference on University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, October 1974. (Xeroxed.)

Gadlin, Howard. "Managing the Large Class: That's Entertainment." Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, September 1974. (Xeroxed.)

Gaff, Jerry. "A List of Instructional Improvement Centers and Programs." The Center for Professional Development, California State University and Colleges, Berkeley, Calif., 1975. (Xeroxed.)

_____. "New Approaches to the Improvement of Instruction." Paper for the National Conference of American Association of Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., 24 March 1975. (Xeroxed.)

Giammatteo, Michael. "Suggested Activities for Learning about Role Behaviors, Problem-Solving and Force Field Techniques." Northwest Regional Education Laboratory, Portland, Oregon, 1969. (Xeroxed.)

Gould, S. "Faculty Development in a Time of Organizational Change." Paper for the International Conference on Improving University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, October 1974. (Xeroxed.)

Grasha, A. F. "Developing Alternative Teaching Methods through an Analysis of Instructional Goals." Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education, University of Cincinnati, February 1974. (Xeroxed.)

_____. "Principles and Models for Assessing Faculty Performance." Teaching-Learning Monograph Series, vol. 1, No. 2. Cincinnati, Ohio: Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education, University of Cincinnati, 8 November 1972. (Xeroxed.)

Horn, Stephen. "Horn-Munsee Interview." Newsletter on Teaching and Learning 1 (September 1974): 1-5. California State University at Long Beach. (Xeroxed.)

Hruska, Jack. "An Analysis of Paul Goodman's Conception of the Nature of Man as a Perspective on His Educational Proposals: A Study in the Philosophical Foundations of Radical Educational Thought." Doctoral disservation, Michigan State University, 1969.

Hunter, M. "The Dimensions of Successful Instruction." Paper for the International Conference on Improving University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/ Amherst, October 1974. (Xeroxed.)

"Intervention by the Legislature." Letter to the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Faculty from Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Society of Professors and the Executive Committee of the American Association of University Professors, May 1974. (Xeroxed.)

Jalling, H. "Director of Studies: New Position for Departmental Instruction Development." Paper for International Conference on Improving University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, October 1974. (Xeroxed.)

Jordan, D. "Implications of Human Development Principles for University Curricula and Teaching." Paper for the International Conference on Improving University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, October 1974. (Xeroxed.)

Keislar, E. "Recent Trends in the Learner and the Learning Process in Schools." Paper prepared for AERA Conference, 1974. (Xeroxed.)

_____. "Some Issues in Learning and Instruction." Paper prepared for AERA Conference, 1974. (Xeroxed.)

Knudson, B. "The Role of the Student in Curriculum Planning." Paper for the International Conference on Improving University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, October 1974. (Xeroxed.)

Kulik, J. A., and McKeachie, W. J. "The Evaluation of Teachers in Higher Education." (Xeroxed.) To appear in Review of Research in Education 2 (September 1978): 1-50, F. N. Kerlinger, ed.

Lauroesch, W., and Keith, Roy. "Final Report, Exploratory Visits to Private Colleges in the Interest of Improved Student Mobility in Massachusetts Higher Education." Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 15 October 1974. (Xeroxed.)

"Leadership and Leadership Functions." National Training Laboratory Workbook. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratory, February 1964, pp. 1-11. (Xeroxed.)

Lindquist, J. "Institutional Services for Teaching Improvement: Combine Your Change Assumptions." Paper for International Conference on Improving University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, October 1974. (Xeroxed.)

Luft, J. "Structural Intervention." Task Force on Group Procedures, American College Personnel Association, 1 September 1971. (Xeroxed.)

McKeachie, W. J. "Changing Teacher Behavior to Improve Instruction." Paper for the International Conference on Improving University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, October 1974. (Xeroxed.)

Majerecik, D. "Teaching Skills Self-Assessment." Paper prepared for Southeast Regional Office of Massachusetts Department of Education and the Inservice Innovator Project of the School of Education, University of Massachusetts/Amherst. (Xeroxed.)

Melnik, M. "The Development and Analysis of a Clinic to Improve University Teaching." Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1972.

"Membership Leadership Functions Which Meet Needs of Group." Selected Readings from Laboratory in Sensitivity Training. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratory, 1972, pp. 23-25. (Xeroxed.)

Miltz, Robert. "Application of Microteaching for University Teaching Improvement: Three Case Studies." Paper for the International Conference of Improving University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/ Amherst, October 1974. (Xeroxed.)

_____. "Micro-Teaching--A Description." Paper for School of Education, University of Massachusetts/ Amherst, 1973. (Xeroxed.)

_____. "Understanding Microteaching as a Concept." Paper for School of Education, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1973. (Xeroxed.)

Noam, Jael. "Developing and Evaluation of a Model for Improving University Teaching." Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1973.

Ofria, Marguerite. "Changes in the Self-Concept." Unpublished psychology honors thesis, University of Massachusetts, May 1974.

Ponnuswami, S. "Mother-Child Interactions and Cognitive Styles." Master's thesis, Delhi University, 1972.

Popham, J. "Higher Education's Commitment to Instructional Development Programs." Paper for International Conference on Improving University Teaching, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, October 1974. (Xeroxed.)